

Pref 7.14/7:

JPRS-TAC-85-004

19 April 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

19 April 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

GENERAL

Antinuclear Weapons Group Wants U.S. Fleet Visit Guarantees (INFORMATION, 12 Feb 85).....	1
Joint Communique on Husak-Stoph Talks (RUDE PRAVO, 23 Mar 85).....	2
Washington Policy on 'Nuclear Hostages' Decried (Voice of GDR Domestic Service, 1 Mar 85).....	4
NATO Exercise Termed Unrealistic, Dangerous (Heinz Britsche; East Berlin Domestic Service, 4 Mar 85)....	6
Romanian Assembly Appeals to USSR, U.S. for Disarmament (SCINTEIA, 30 Mar 85).....	7
Arming of Pakistan Damages Indo-U.S. Relations (G. K. Reddy; THE HINDU, 13 Feb 85).....	10
Japan Looks Over New Zealand's Shoulder (Simon Holberton; THE AGE, 23 Jan 85).....	11
Briefs	
Nuclear Disarmament in Election	13

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Comments on Arms Control During Shcherbitskiy Visit to Washington (Various sources, various dates).....	14
Arrival Statement	14
Talks With Congressmen	15

Discussions Continue	16
Discusses SDI With Congressmen, by L. Koryavin, A. Palladin	18
Shcherbitskiy Press Conference	20
Comment on SDI	21
Meeting With Reagan	23
Further Comment to Congressmen on SDI	23
Talks Discussed in 7 Mar Politburo Session	
(PRAVDA, 8 Mar 85).....	25
Biographical Data on Geneva Delegation Noted	
(TASS, 7 Mar 85).....	26
Finnish Official: Negative Security Pledges Inadequate	
(Lauri Karen; HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 13 Mar 85).....	28
Leuschner Views East-West Contacts Prior to Geneva	
(East Berlin Domestic Service, 4 Mar 85).....	29
Honecker Expresses Support for USSR Arms Stance	
(ADN International Service, 10 Mar 85).....	31
Importance of Geneva Talks Stressed	
(ADN International Service, 10 Mar 85).....	32
GDR Daily Previews Prospects for Geneva Talks	
(ADN International Service, 12 Mar 85).....	33
Soviet Positions Allow Far-Reaching Agreements	
(Guenther Leuschner; Voice of GDR Domestic Service, 11 Mar 85).....	35
Kaeubler Condemns Senate Approval of MX Funding	
(Voice of GDR Domestic Service, 20 Mar 85).....	37
XINHUA on U.S.-USSR Arms Talks in Geneva	
(XINHUA, various dates, XINHUA Domestic Service, 13, 21 Mar 85).....	39
FRG's Kohl 'Optimistic'	39
Sweden Calls Talks 'Inspiring'	39
Third Session Held	39
Further Report	40
No Breakthrough Seen	40
'Star Wars,' Arms Talks	42
CSSR, GDR Welcome Talks	43
Poland's Jaruzelski Comments	44
Gorbachev Comments on Expectations	44
U.S. Urged To Show Realism	44
Further Report, by Chen Yonqian	45

Demonstrators Rally in Geneva Against Arms Race (XINHUA, 13 Mar 85).....	46
---	----

SPACE ARMS

Importance of Stopping Space Militarization Stressed (A. Platonov; MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN', No 3, Mar 85).....	47
Chernyshev Notes SDI Preparation Consequences (TASS, 15 Mar 85).....	59
French Defense Officials Urge Military Space Capability (LE MONDE, 16 Mar 85).....	61
French General Urges Realism on 'Star Wars' Repercussion (Fricaud-Chagnaud; LE MONDE, 29 Jan 85).....	63
PCI Deputy Says SDI Increases Possibility of War (Luciana Castellina; L'UNITA, 16 Mar 85).....	66
L'UNITA Warns of 'Dangerous Confusion' on SDI (L'UNITA, 19 Mar 85).....	68
Van Den Broek Cautions Parliament on SDI (ANP NEWS BULLETIN, 7 Mar 85).....	70
Gromyko Concludes Madrid Visit (Madrid Domestic Service, 1 Mar 85; EFE, 1, 2 Mar 85).....	72
Moran, Gromyko Luncheon Toasts	72
Gromyko on Arms Race	73
Moran News Conference on Visit, by Fernando Moran	73
Moran, Gromyko on 'Star Wars'	74
Gromyko Leaves; No Communique Issued	74
Positions on Military Uses of Space Presented (Gyula Gal Interview; NEPSZABADSAG, 4 Mar 85).....	76
West Europe's Reaction to 'Star Wars' Examined (Lin Sheng; RENMIN RIBAO, 2 Apr 85).....	79
NATO Defense Ministers Discuss Nuclear Plans (XINHUA, 27 Mar 85).....	80
FRG Undecided About Space Defense Research (XINHUA, 27 Mar 85).....	81
Briefs	
Franco-Soviet Military Consultations	82

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Gorbachev Announces INF Deployment Moratorium in Europe (PRAVDA, 8 Apr 85; TASS, 5, 8 Apr 85).....	83
Gorbachev Interview	83
U.S. Response Criticized	86
U.S. 'Goodwill Gestures' Urged	87
Paper Comments on Nordic Zone in Light of Sobolev Statement (Editorial; UUSI SUOMI, 27 Feb 85).....	89
Foreign Ministry Sees Less Urgency for Zone Talks (UUSI SUOMI, 27 Feb 85).....	91
LE SOIR Views Progress on Missile Deployment (LE SOIR, 22 Feb 85).....	92
L'UNITA Views Strategic Defense Initiative (Marco De Andries; L'UNITA, 27 Feb 85).....	94

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

West Opposes Auxiliary Arms Talks at UN Conference (TASS, 19 Mar 85).....	97
Polish Delegate to UN Disarmament Conference Speaks Out (PAP, 13 Feb, 20 Mar 85; RZECZPOSPOLITA, 16-17 Feb 85).....	99
Formal Address Delivered, by Edward Dylawski	99
Chemical Weapons Ban, by Stanislaw Turbanski	100
Space Arms Race	101

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

Paper Comments on Chernenko Letter to Nuclear Disarmament Group (Editorial; AFTENPOSTEN, 15 Feb 85).....	102
Briefs	
Nuclear-Free Baltic Urged	104

GENERAL

ANTINUCLEAR WEAPONS GROUP WANTS U.S. FLEET VISIT GUARANTEES

Copenhagen INFORMATION in Danish 12 Feb 85 p 12

[Article: "No To Nuclear Weapons Wants Guarantees from United States on Fleet Visits"]

[Text] Denmark should follow New Zealand's example so that, before visits by American warships to Danish ports, the United States would guarantee that there were no nuclear weapons on board, the organization No To Nuclear Weapons stated in a letter to the government and to parliament.

The statement was triggered by the recent incident involving a naval visit to New Zealand that was rejected by the government of that country because the United States would not guarantee that the destroyer USS Buchanan had no nuclear weapons on board. In connection with this incident, American officials said that Denmark and Norway made no special demands on the American ships.

"We must conclude from this that the United States does not understand the Danish position on nuclear weapons. We must call on the government and parliament to clear up this misunderstanding on the part of the United States immediately," the letter from No To Nuclear Weapons states.

American researcher William Arkin, coauthor of the authoritative handbook Nuclear Weapons Databook which describes American nuclear weapons in detail, confirmed to INFORMATION that the United States offers Denmark no guarantees before fleet visits.

"My sources within the navy say that no statements whatsoever are sent to Denmark beforehand," Arkin said.

No To Nuclear Weapons stated in its letter that, "The parliamentary resolution against nuclear weapons on Danish territory during times of peace also applies to ships, even when they are simply visiting. If there is no guarantee that this demand will be met, then Denmark must inspect all visiting ships that could conceivably carry nuclear weapons."

9336
CSO: 3613/112

GENERAL

JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON HUSAK-STOPH TALKS

AU251921 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 23 Mar 85 p 2

["Joint Communiqué" issued in Prague on 22 March at the close of a "friendly working" visit to the CSSR by Willi Stoph, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers]

[Excerpts] Willi Stoph, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, paid a friendly working visit to the CSSR from 20 to 22 March 1985 at the invitation of CSSR Premier Lubomir Strougal.

Willi Stoph was received by Gustav Husak, CPCZ Central Committee general secretary and CSSR president, to whom he conveyed comradely greetings from Erich Honecker, SED Central Committee general secretary and GDR State Council chairman. Gustav Husak warmly reciprocated these greetings.

The exchange of views on the basic issues of the present international situation confirmed a full identity of positions. The two sides stressed that the permanent endeavor of the United States and NATO to achieve military supremacy and their aspiration to deal with international problems from a position of strength continue to complicate the world situation and pose a threat to peace. Lubomir Strougal and Willi Stoph confirmed the CSSR and the GDR's resolve, together with other fraternal socialist states and in cooperation with all forces of reason and realism, to consistently and in a constructive spirit seek to reduce world tension; eliminate the threat of a nuclear war; adopt effective steps in the sphere of disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament; and avert the militarization of outer space. They are convinced that space militarization would initiate a new round in the arms race and dangerously upset the strategic equilibrium.

They stressed that the path toward arms reduction is shown by the important peace initiatives that emerged from the January 1983 Prague Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee statement; the June 1983 Moscow Joint Statement; the June 1984 GEMA Economic Summit Declarations; and other proposals advanced by the USSR and the states of the socialist community.

The two heads of government welcomed the USSR-U.S. Geneva talks on the entire complex of issues concerning nuclear and space arms. They expressed support for the accord on the objects and aims of deliberations and for the USSR's approach to these negotiations. At the same time, they expressed the hope that the United States, too, will contribute by its realistic and constructive attitude to the kind of positive result of these talks which would open the way to reducing, and finally totally removing nuclear arms.

Steps like commitments by all nuclear powers not to be the first to use nuclear arms; like ending the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe and liquidating new systems; like a general freeze of nuclear arms and the elimination of all nuclear arms tests -- such steps would make the world more secure and would create a more favorable climate for the Geneva negotiations. The GDR and CSSR are convinced that all states have the ability, and also the moral duty, to act in this spirit.

The two sides pointed out their countries' efforts at the Stockholm conference and the Vienna negotiations to help reduce the danger of military confrontation in Europe. At the same time, they emphasized the topical and balanced nature of the initiatives submitted by the Warsaw Pact member-states in Stockholm, initiatives which organically combine extensive steps of a political and international-legal nature with measures for strengthening trust in the military sphere and that further develop the Helsinki Final Act. They also emphasized the constructive nature of the proposals the socialist states have made in Vienna.

Aiming to definitely remove all mass destruction weapons, the two sides are purposefully promoting the liberation of Europe from the terrible means of mass destruction as the first step toward the worldwide elimination of chemical arms.

In view of the approaching 10th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, the heads of the two governments recalled that the socialist states have been the main initiators of European security and cooperation. Today, too, they are devoting all their strength to the continuation and intensification of this process.

Lubomir Strougal and Willi Stoph stressed that recognition of the territorial and political realities resulting from World War II and the postwar arrangement, and which have been affirmed by the Helsinki Final Act, is the inevitable prerequisite for European security and cooperation.

CSO: 5200/3007

GENERAL

WASHINGTON POLICY ON 'NUCLEAR HOSTAGES' DECRIED

DW011333 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 1210 GMT 1 Mar 85

[Retired Colonel Wolfgang Lehmann commentary]

[Text] It truly is no easy task which Washington's emissaries must cope with as they are farmed out over the Western Hemisphere by the dozen. According to a high-ranking U.S. Government official they are supposed to counteract the aversions against any kind of contact with nuclear weapons which obviously are spreading among the Western allies. In plain terms this means that they are supposed to soothe the ever growing wave of irritation over the U.S. nuclear war plans on the ground, at sea, in the air, and in outer space. They are to play down the dangers emerging for the continued existence of all mankind. With a carrot and a stick they are supposed to keep the allies toeing the line.

But this is asking as much as squaring a circle. Moreover, the U.S. Administration with its actions is not making the mission of its emissaries any easier, for instance, with its plans, hatched several years ago, for the further deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons abroad. Resourceful journalists found out that so-called contingency plans have been existing for about 10 years according to which nuclear weapons are to be stockpiled -- and if in critical situations -- in Canada, Iceland, Puerto Rico, and in the Bermudas.

The revelation of these plans has, of course, elicited exasperation and outrage in top government circles of the countries concerned. Quite justly so, for what has transpired?

The United States ignores the sovereign rights of other states with the sensitivity of a bulldozer, as it were. Nobody was asked whether they wanted the U.S. nuclear weapons at all. What is worse, Washington did not shrink from lies and fraud. When the unsuspecting Canadian defense minister inquired in the United States whether such plans existed, he received a reply which induced him to make the announcement in the Ottawa lower house that there is no such thing. Days later he had to admit that he had been deceived.

As for Bermuda, it is interesting to note that it constitutes a British Crown Colony for whose defense Great Britain is responsible and not the United States. Even treaties valid under international law apparently do not form a barrier for U.S. nuclear war planners. They envisaged deployment of nuclear weapons in Puerto Rico would violate the treaty on the ban of nuclear weapons in Latin America dating back to 1967. The United States signed a protocol which is part of this treaty.

19 April 1985

GENERAL

NATO EXERCISE TERMED UNREALISTIC, DANGEROUS

LD050045 East Berlin Domestic Service in German 2110 AT 4 Mar 85

[Commentary by Heinz Britsche]

[Excerpt] The first part of the NATO staff exercise "Wintex-Cimex" is more or less over, and the second phase starts this week. The first part was concerned with so-called crisis management. This failed. The second part, in which the stand-in Federal Government will disappear into the bunker in the Eiffel, will simulate war. Two days separate the two parts of the exercise and are meant to represent a period of 40 days, during which the U.S. reinforcement divisions will arrive in their positions in accordance with Wartime Host Nation Support, the support agreement between the FRG and U.S. Governments. There are six divisions and some 1,000 combat planes, but this, time only in theory.

For their support, the Bundeswehr is to make available additional support units totaling 90,000 men, and under Point G there is even provision in the event of war for the Bundeswehr auxiliary troops to take over the prisoners of war taken by the GI's. But, back to the "Wintex" staff exercise, in which everything is enacted by the staffs on paper. Not only NATO military staffs, with the exception of Greece, but civilian authorities, too, such as those in Bavaria, Baden-Wuerttemberg, the Rhineland Palatinate, Lower Saxony, and Schleswig Holstein are involved.

It is undoubtedly a scenario of total war. It would be very appropriate if the presidents of nations and senior civil servants involved were perhaps reminded of a time 40 years ago when, in March 1944, Hitler issued his infamous "Nero Order" according to which all military, transport, communications, industrial, and supply plants had to be destroyed during the Wehrmacht's retreat, as well as all things of material value. Now the scorched earth policy, which Hitler's Wehrmacht practiced for years in other countries in a criminal manner, is to be applied in their own country and against their own population. Even Hitler's "Nero Order" was not able to delay his defeat.

This week in the FRG and in other NATO countries, war is being rehearsed in the staff exercise, and in accordance with the existing guidelines this war would very quickly escalate to a nuclear war. A new "Nero Order" would thus be superfluous from the outset. For this reason, the "Wintex-Cimex" staff exercise must be assessed as unrealistic and dangerous. Moreover, the period of tension rehearsed in the first phase can only be the result of a policy resulting from the renewed formulation of the aims of U.S. foreign policy.

CSO: S200/3017

GENERAL

ROMANIAN ASSEMBLY APPEALS TO USSR, U.S. FOR DISARMAMENT

AU021131 Bucharest SCINTEIA in Romanian 30 Mar 85 p 6

["Appeal of the Grand National Assembly of the SR of Romania to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the U.S. Congress, and parliaments of all European Countries and of Canada"]

[Text] The Ninth Grand National Assembly (GNA) of the Socialist Republic of Romania meeting in the first session, states its full attachment to Socialist Romania's domestic and international policy and its high appreciation of the prodigious activity of the president of the country, Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, whose role has been fundamental in the implementation of the homeland's economic and social development program and of Romania's policy of peace, broad international cooperation, security, and understanding among peoples.

The Grand National Assembly, in the name of the Romanian people, fully supports President Nicolae Ceausescu's activity, proposals, and initiatives to end the arms race, the nuclear race more particularly, to halt the testing, development and deployment of new nuclear weapons in Europe, to free the continent of all nuclear weapons in Europe, achieve disarmament and ensure peace throughout the world.

The Grand National Assembly, in a spirit of strong attachment and unanimity, in full agreement with all our people's will and aspirations, most firmly supports the ringing appeal that Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, president of the SR of Romania, made from the rostrum of this high democratic forum of the country in his solemn acceptance speech to parliaments, heads of state and government, all peace-loving forces to do everything they can and stop the arms race, pass on to disarmament, nuclear first and foremost, defend the foremost right of individuals and peoples to develop freely and independently, to exist, to live in peace.

Deeply concerned over the very serious world situation, the Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania has decided to call now, at the beginning of its term, on European, U.S. and Canadian parliaments and governments to take joint action, with a high sense of responsibility, and stop the current dangerous course of the international events, firmly promote a policy of detente, disarmament, cooperation, and peace.

Huge quantities of nuclear weapons have accumulated in the world that could destroy mankind several times and that go far beyond any security reasons. The arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, has been going on and its scope has grown, increasing the threat of another world war that would inevitably become a nuclear one and that

would destroy all civilization, indeed, all possibility of life on our planet. A highly dangerous situation has developed in Europe after new nuclear missiles continued to be sited. There is a greater danger that the arms race could extend to space, which would further step up military competition, and considerably increase the threat of a destructive war.

Under these circumstances, the cardinal issue of our time is to stop the arms race, the nuclear race more particularly, begin disarmament, avert the threat of another world war, ensure world peace. Responsible action should be taken by all states, by the nuclear states first of all, to achieve real disarmament measures and remove nuclear threat.

The Romanian people, like other European and world peoples, welcomed the beginning, on March 21, of talks between the USSR and the United States on nuclear and space weapons. But the start of negotiations alone does not mean that any of the very serious problems has been solved.

It is essential that efforts be made so that the negotiations may fulfill the peoples' expectations, lead to appropriate agreements on the cessation of the arms race, and of the nuclear race first and foremost, bring about a reduction of nuclear weapons down to their complete elimination, and stop the militarization of space.

The Grand National Assembly of the SR of Romania calls on the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Congress of the U.S. to do everything possible for the Geneva negotiations to be held in a constructive spirit of understanding and high sense of responsibility for the security, peace and lives of all peoples, duly considering the need that, through concessions by both sides, a suspension of the talks be avoided and appropriate agreements be concluded.

The questions that are the subject of the Soviet-American talks are of tremendous importance for the destinies of all mankind. In consideration of the highest responsibility that we parliaments have before our peoples, for their peace and lives, the Grand National Assembly of the SR of Romania calls on all the European and the Canadian Parliaments to work in concert and contribute in appropriate ways to the Geneva talks so that they may have tangible results as soon as possible, in agreement with the interests and aspirations of the world's nations.

At the same time the Grand National Assembly of the SR of Romania addresses to the U.S. Congress and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR the call to stop, for the duration of the Geneva negotiations, the testing and production of new nuclear weapons, the siting of the American intermediate-range missiles in Europe and simultaneously the nuclear counter-measures announced by the USSR, to halt any action aimed at the militarization of space.

Taking such measures would contribute to building an atmosphere of confidence, favoring the progress and successful conclusion of the negotiations. There is no reason for the production and placement of new nuclear weapons to continue during the negotiations as long as their aim is a passage to a drastic cut in nuclear weapons down to their total elimination from Europe and the world.

Taking account of the seriousness of the situation in Europe as a consequence of the great concentration of nuclear and other mass-destruction weapons, the conclusion of agreements to provide for the withdrawal of nuclear missiles from the European Continent and free it from any nuclear weapon will have to be a priority of the negotiations. At the same time, since the issues of nuclear weapons and outer space militarization concern all the states of the world, other states, too, should take action and contribute toward agreements to avert the nuclear threat on earth and in outer space.

To this end the Grand National Assembly of the SR of Romania calls on the parliaments and governments of the European countries to work firmly, to assume a greater responsibility, to contribute to the Soviet-American negotiations so that they may end in good results, and adequate agreements to made on nuclear weapons and plans for the militarization of space be given up.

We particularly call on the parliaments and governments of the European countries on whose territory intermediate-range missiles are located and most of the nuclear weapons are concentrated, to work most firmly in consideration of their responsibility for the fate of their peoples, of peace in Europe and throughout the world and for agreement to be reached at the Geneva negotiations to stop bringing new nuclear missiles to the European Continent and to withdraw all nuclear weapons from it.

To the same end, we believe it is necessary that the Warsaw Pact and the NATO countries should meet and discuss the possibility of adequate agreements conducive to the removal of intermediate-range missiles and of other nuclear weapons from Europe.

The Grand National Assembly of the SR of Romania also believes that while the Soviet-American talks in Geneva are in progress, the activity of international disarmament bodies and conferences should intensify.

The Grand National Assembly of the SR of Romania calls on the parliaments and government of the USSR and the U.S. of all European countries and of Canada to take concerted action in a constructive spirit, for the success of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building and Disarmament, for an accord to be reached as soon as possible at the Vienna negotiations on troops and armament reduction in central Europe, for effective talks at the Geneva disarmament conference.

The conclusion of adequate accords at these international conferences and bodies would be of utmost importance for confidence-building and development of cooperation, would help lessen international tension, give an impetus to disarmament activities, and provide for the success of the talks between the USSR and the U.S.

We call on all parliaments, and governments, on all states, to do everything possible -- beyond differences of social system or philosophical beliefs -- to halt the arms race and remove the danger of a nuclear catastrophe, to defend the foremost right of peoples to exist, to develop freely and independently, to live in peace.

We hold the view that, by working together, with a sense of responsibility and in a constructive spirit, we can change the course of events, ease international tension and pass to a policy of detente, disarmament, cooperation, understanding and peace.

The Grand National Assembly of the SR of Romania voices the Romanian people's will of and aspirations for peace, expresses its resolve to work unflinchingly, with the parliaments of all European countries, of the U.S. and Canada, to contribute to the cessation of the arms race and the achievement of disarmament, to the success of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, to relieving mankind of the nightmare of nuclear disaster, for international peace, detente, security and broad cooperation.

CSO: 5200/3015

GENERAL

ARMING OF PAKISTAN DAMAGES INDO-U.S. RELATIONS

Madras THE HINDU in English 13 Feb 85 p 9

[Article by G. K. Reddy]

[Text]

NEW DELHI, Feb. 12

The U.S. Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs, Mr. Michael Armacost, the second seniormost functionary in the State Department, will be visiting the sub-continent next month for talks on both bilateral and regional issues.

He is due to visit India and Pakistan, but it is not known whether he would be going to Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka also on this occasion.

But the basic purpose of his trip is to explore the prospects for "upgrading" Indo-American relations with some imaginative moves during the visit of the Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, to the U.S. in June without detriment to the existing security links with Pakistan.

The main thrust of the U.S. effort to establish better understanding with India will be in the technological sphere to help the country modernise and expand its industry and enhance its agricultural output for the good of its people. It is with this object in view that the U.S. has been pressing India to send an official delegation to Washington soon to settle the procedures for transfer of high technology as a follow up to the Memorandum of Understanding already initiated by representatives of the two Governments.

Right climate: According to diplomatic reports from Washington, the Reagan administration thinks that the present political climate in India is just right for making a renewed effort to work towards a mutually beneficial relationship consistent with their respective interests. It is with this object in view that the Secretary of State, Mr. George Shultz, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee early this month that, as part of a "comprehensive review" of U.S. foreign policy, the administration

hoped to see the relationship with India "improve and flower" as he put it.

In an appreciative reference to the new political atmosphere in India, he said, "I hope that as time passes we will find with his (Mr. Rajiv Gandhi's) leadership and influence, and our own reaction to that, an ability to work in a strong way with the Government of India because it is of such importance". He spoke of his brief meeting with Mr. Rajiv Gandhi at the time of Indira Gandhi's funeral in Delhi, in laudatory terms, while cautioning at the same time that the current U.S. desire for a closer relationship with India should not be misconstrued as a readiness to dilute the security links with Pakistan.

The visit of Mr. Armacost, reflecting this new mood in Washington, is intended to set the tone for improvement of Indo-American relations. But it is not going to be easy for him to perform this rope trick by adhering to the present policy of arming Pakistan with more and more sophisticated weapons-systems.

Any American concessions made to mollify India, through transfer of technology and other overtures, cannot really redress the damage done by the U.S. policy of intensifying the arms race in the sub-continent. The Indo-U.S. relationship has to be viewed in its totality, not compartmentally, for ending the continuing crisis of confidence.

Sri Lanka issue: The only saving grace at the moment is the consistent U.S. refusal to get involved in the Sri Lankan problem. The present administration has been trying to impress upon the Sri Lankan President, Mr. J. R. Jayewardene the need for a political settlement of the Tamil problem to preserve the unity and integrity of this island State. And in the process the U.S. has been urging him to utilise India's good offices in resolving this problem.

CSO: 5250/0001

CONFIDENTIAL

JAPAN LOOKS OVER NEW ZEALAND'S SHOULDER

Melbourne THE AGE in English 23 Jan 85 p 8

[Article by Simon Holberton]

[Text]

TOKYO, 22 Jan. — Early last month Japanese demonstrators turned out in their thousands to protest against the United States' most sophisticated aircraft carrier, the nuclear-powered USS Carl Vinson.

Like the demonstrations in New Zealand, when US nuclear-powered ships visited its ports, the demonstration at Yokosuka naval base was indicative of the grass-roots, if sectional, opposition to nuclear ship visits in Japan.

The Japanese people's reaction to their alliance with the US and the issue of nuclear ship visits is complex and has its roots in their war-time experience of militarism and of being the only people to suffer a nuclear attack.

The fear of resurgent militarism was responsible for massive demonstrations, in which more than five million took to the streets nation-wide. The demonstrations dogged the parliamentary sanction of the renegotiated Treaty of Mutual Co-operation and Security between the US and Japan in 1959-60.

But the focus of public concern has since switched from the treaty as such to what it demands of Japan. That is where nuclear ships, Anzus and disarmament come in, not to mention the issue of Japanese rearmament.

As one Western diplomatic observer put it: "There is a great deal of concern on the part of the Japanese Government about what is happening in New Zealand. If a deal is struck it could have obvious repercussions here."

These "obvious repercussions"

are that the New Zealand action raises the question of how an American ally can deal with the US while excluding the visits to its ports of nuclear-powered and nuclear-armed ships.

Already the port of Yokosuka acts as a quasi-home port for units of the US Seventh Fleet — including the aircraft carrier USS Midway — and many believe that nuclear weapons are actually stored within the confines of the giant US naval base there.

The treaty which the then Prime Minister, Nobusuke Kishi, and the then Secretary of State of the US, Christian Herter, signed in Washington in January 1960 stated that the US "for the purpose of contributing to the security of Japan" was granted the use of land, air and naval facilities in Japan.

It was left to an exchange of "notes", three days later, to clarify US responsibilities in reporting any major movements in materiel or personnel into Japan.

The note said, among other things, that any "major changes in the deployment into Japan" of forces and equipment being contemplated by the US "shall be the subjects of prior consultation with the Government of Japan."

But it wasn't until 1968 that the Japanese Government enunciated its now famous three non-nuclear principles: not to make, possess or allow nuclear weapons on Japanese soil.

What prompted the Prime Minister of the day, Eisaku Sato, to declare them were big demonstrations in response to a visit by the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier the USS Enterprise to the port

of Sasebo, near Nagasaki.

Then, as now, Japan's principal opposition parties were opposed to such visits by nuclear ships. The opposition has even permeated down to the local government sector with the City of Kobe, for example, banning naval ship visits unless written assurances are given that the ship in question is not nuclear armed.

In September last year the mayors of Japan's major naval ports — Yokosuka, Sasebo, Kure and Maizuru — adopted a joint resolution calling on the Japanese Government to abide by the three non-nuclear principles.

Resolve

The comments made by retired-Admiral La Roque in Washington yesterday, that all US aircraft carriers are nuclear armed, as are most of the US Navy's cruisers, will only add to the opposition group's fears. It will also strengthen its resolve to force the Japanese Government into adhering to the non-nuclear principles.

As a spokesman for the main

opposition party, the Japan Socialist Party, said today: "The issue has to be resolved."

"Japanese opposition parties are demanding that the US to give notice of their intention to bring nuclear weapons into Japan.

"At this point the reality is that there is no way to verify whether or not they bring in nuclear weapons.

The JSP spokesman said the three non-nuclear principles have really become 2.5 non-nuclear principles. "In order to maintain the principles, the Japanese Government should reject port calls of US warships."

While that is not a policy the present Japanese Government would ever consider adopting, there does seem to be some public support for a more vigorous adherence to the three principles.

A recent survey conducted by a major Tokyo daily, the 'Yomiuri Shinbun', showed that 53.5 per cent of the respondents agreed that the Government should conform "by all means" to the principles.

CSO: 5200/01

GENERAL

BRIEFS

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT IN ELECTION--"No to Nuclear Weapons" is in the course of mounting its campaign prior to the parliamentary election under the slogan "Parliamentary majority against nuclear weapons," the group's informal leader, Ole Kopreitan, informs AFTENPOSTEN. As a contribution to this movement, the executive committee of the Association of Norwegian Municipalities yesterday granted 50,000 kroner for the work of "No to Nuclear Weapons." A comparable amount was received two weeks ago from the Norwegian Chemical Industrial Workers' Alliance. Kopreitan said that in the campaign's first phase appeals are made to the annual county meetings of the various political parties. [Text] [Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 6 Feb 85 p 4] 12723

CSO: 3639/75

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

COMMENTS ON ARMS CONTROL DURING SHCHERBITSKIY VISIT TO WASHINGTON

Arrival Statement

LD041048 Moscow TASS in English 1033 GMT 4 Mar 85

[Excerpts] Washington March 4 TASS--A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, arrived in Washington on March 3rd at the invitation of the House of Representatives of U.S. Congress.

Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, in his statement thanked the leaders of the Congress for the invitation. He pointed out that in the current tense international situation the legislators of the two countries bear a major share of responsibility for the destinies of the world. They should use every possibility to remove the threat of war and to save the human civilization from annihilation. No one has the moral right to stand aside from the solution of that crucial problem today.

The new Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space arms will start shortly in Geneva, Vladimir Shcherbitskiy said. A few days ago K. U. Chernenko, head of our state, in his election campaign speech set forth once again our position of principle. The Soviet Union does not seek to get any unilateral advantages vis-a-vis the United States, it wants the cessation, not the continuation of the arms race. A successful outcome of the negotiations would be a major contribution to solving the first priority and the most important problem of today, i.e., removing the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet Union will follow firmly and scrupulously the agreement on the subject and objectives of the negotiations. We expect the same from the United States.

Our people, the head of the Soviet delegation stressed, know very well the real worth of peace. Unprecedented are our sacrifices suffered during the war against Hitlerite fascism. Next May the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism will be celebrated. To bring about that victory the Soviet people fought alongside the United States and other allies. Now the danger of nuclear war is our common enemy. Our efforts must be joined against it. Neither differences in the social system of our countries, nor ideological considerations should become obstacles in the way of that objective.

LD050753 Moscow TASS in English 0711 GMT 5 Mar 85

[Excerpts] Washington March 5 TASS--Discussion began here on Monday between a delegation from the Supreme Soviet of the USSR led by Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, which has arrived in the United States at the invitation of the House of Representatives of American Congress, and a delegation from the House of Representatives.

The discussion at the House Foreign Affairs Committee centered on questions of preventing a nuclear war and limiting and reducing arms.

Thomas Foley, deputy leader of the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives, Congressmen Lee Hamilton, James Leach, Larry Smith, Steven Solarz and others, who spoke in the course of the discussions, said that American legislators attached more significance to contacts at different levels between the USSR and the United States, to consolidating stable relations between the two countries and to reducing the risk of confrontation between them by various means, including bilateral dialogue.

At the same time a number of American participants in the discussion spoke out in favor of work to develop a comprehensive ABM system with space-based elements, in favor of "star wars".

In their well-reasoned statements, Soviet parliamentarians showed concretely all the danger, for mankind and the USA itself, of the plans being hatched by Washington for spreading the arms race to space and building up nuclear armaments on earth. They also drew attention to increasingly frequent pronouncements made lately by American officials and not consistent with the task of creating a favourable atmosphere for the forthcoming Soviet-American talks in Geneva on space and nuclear armaments. Members of the Delegation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR stressed the need for strict observance of the joint Soviet-American statement on the subject and objectives of the mentioned talks, adopted in Geneva on January 8 this year.

Soviet and American parliamentarians, at their meeting, listened with attention to a speech by the head of the Soviet delegation, Vladimir Shcherbitskiy. He said: "Esteemed Mr Foley, esteemed Mr Hamilton, esteemed members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to thank you for the greetings to our delegation. We, in turn, express satisfaction with the possibility of exchanging views on issues of Soviet-American relations and the international situation in general with representatives of the U.S. legislative body.

"What is our view of the meaning and main goal of forthcoming conversations? They, we think, should aim at discussing the most important problem of ways by which the Soviet Union and the United States could jointly avert the threat of nuclear war. We believe that progress to that goal should be made through preventing the arms race in space and terminating it on earth.

"As we all know, Soviet-American talks on these problems will shortly begin in Geneva. That is why we should look for ways and means of creating a favourable atmosphere around the talks. Clearly, some actions can hamper a search for accords while others can ease that process.

"The U.S. Congress, we think, is aware that the Soviet Union has listed a number of measures which could contribute effectively to the success of the talks and to the accomplishment of the final goal of our efforts, namely, the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

"Konstantin Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, mentioned specifically in his statements such steps as the reaching of an accord by the USSR and the USA to observe in their relationships certain norms, the putting into effect of the treaties on subterranean nuclear explosions, concluded in 1974 and 1976, and the resumption and completion of the talks (which were conducted jointly with Britain) on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and on freezing the nuclear arms arsenals of all the nuclear powers, with the Soviet Union and the United States displaying initiative in this field.

"There is no doubt that U.S. readiness to follow the example of the USSR and make a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons would be very conducive to stronger trust between our countries and reduce the nuclear danger. As far as we know, there are sentiments in U.S. Congress in favor of lessening international tension, curbing the arms race and generally improving relations with the Soviet Union, and the proposals I mentioned apparently were a subject of consideration in your legislative agency, in any case in the committees dealing with foreign affairs."

Discussions Continue

LD061133 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0825 GMT 6 Mar 85

[Excerpts] Washington, 6 Mar (TASS)--The delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet, headed by Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, which is visiting the United States at the invitation of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, continued its discussions here on Tuesday with a delegation from the House of Representatives. The discussions focused on a range of questions connected with the Soviet-U.S. talks to be held shortly in Geneva and interstate relations between the USSR and the United States. A speech was delivered by Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, head of the Soviet delegation. He said:

Our states are great powers. This is not a privilege for them. It is a great responsibility before the world. The foremost requirement is to display mutual restraint, to respect each other's laws and interests. International security is already fragile at the present time. The fanning of smouldering hotbeds of conflict and the creation of explosive new situations must not be allowed. It goes without saying, if one is to be guided

by the broad interests of peace, the most important thing is to orient one's policy in a practical sense toward the prevention of nuclear disaster and ultimately to work for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

In this respect I shall point out that the USSR was the first to resolutely advocate the complete outlawing of nuclear weapons and their elimination from the face of the earth. It did so right from the start, from the moment when atomic weapons first appeared. Back in 1946 we put forward most radical proposals on this score. We advocated the complete destruction of atomic weapons. Just think how much easier life would be for people today, if this proposal had been adopted.

Recently, in an effort to finally break the vicious circle of the arms race, the USSR made a unilateral and solemn commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The USSR resolutely desires a resumption of talks about a universal halt to nuclear weapons tests. Resolution of this problem would also be helped by the implementation of the Soviet-American treaties of 1974 and 1976 on underground nuclear blasts.

I should particularly like to dwell on the question of a quantitative and qualitative freeze of nuclear arsenals. This problem has repeatedly been touched upon by the USSR, but the situation, owing to the position of the American side, has not moved, i.e., the very question of a freeze has been frozen.

It is often said that, allegedly, a freeze is not a cut, so is it worth striving for? Regarding this, it must be said that when the Supreme Soviet adopted the appropriate decision in June 1983, it was specially stipulated that a freeze was regarded only as a first step, which should then be followed by a considerable cut, and eventually complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Advocating insistently that real steps be taken to reduce the level of nuclear confrontation, we note with satisfaction the Soviet-American accord that has been reached on talks on a set of questions concerning both space and nuclear weapons. I must say that the Soviet delegation at the talks in Geneva will work energetically for effective accord on preventing an arms race in outer space and halting it on earth.

We cannot agree with those, who are trying even now, to accustom people to the idea that the talks will go on for years and that it will take virtually a decade to find a common approach to the solution of the problem of nuclear and space weapons. Behind such arguments one can perceive an unwillingness to work with a positive result in mind.

They want to present the world with faits accomplis, especially where weapons suitable for carrying out so-called star wars are concerned. In other words, they are paving the way to an arms race in space. And this is being done, to speak plainly, in order to acquire the potential of inflicting

a first strike with impunity. You cannot change the sinister purpose of the planned antimissile system by talking about its allegedly "humane" and "defensive" nature. The system is aimed at achieving military superiority over the USSR. But this is not feasible. The USSR will never allow it.

We must keep our feet on the ground and construct our relations on the principle of equality and equal security, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, and mutual respect.

We are convinced that there are no insoluble problems between the USSR and the United States. We must, however, not attempt to impose our ideas, concepts, and ways of life on others. We must proceed from the fact that we are different and take account of this. Such an understanding will help us to find points of contact and search for mutually beneficial solutions to truly important problems for the welfare of our two peoples and for the benefit of the whole world.

On the same day the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation met congressional members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. During a detailed exchange of opinions they discussed the search for ways of normalizing Soviet-American relations and improving the international situation in general, as well as the forthcoming Geneva talks. Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, head of the Soviet delegation, delivered a speech to the American senators.

Discusses SDI With Congressmen

PM061509 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Mar 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondents L. Koryavin and A. Palladin: "Parliamentarians' Discussion: USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation in the United States"]

[Excerpts] Washington--In the history of Soviet-American relations bilateral parliamentary ties occupy a relatively short period--only 10 years. The first time USSR Supreme Soviet delegates visited the United States was in 1974; there was a return visit to our country by U.S. congressmen a year later. There were another two meetings after that, and now the fifth has begun: After a break of 7 years, a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, headed by V. V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, has arrived in the United States.

At the very beginning of its stay on U.S. soil, the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation stated its desire to establish fruitful official contacts with U.S. legislators for the sake of normalizing relations between our two states and for the sake of an overall improvement in the international situation.

...Next to the Capitol, on Independence Avenue, there is one of the Congress buildings, the so-called "Rayburn Building." It was there, at the House of Representatives Foreign Relations Committee, that the first working meeting was held with the U.S. legislators on 4 March. A wide range of questions

was discussed, but special attention was devoted to problems of war and peace, questions of preventing a nuclear catastrophe and limiting and reducing armaments.

There were supporters of these plans among the members of the House of Representatives who participated in the 4 March discussion with the Soviet parliamentary delegation. Reiterating what are known to be false claims about the militarization of space being innocuous, a number of U.S. legislators advocated the implementation of these dangerous plans.

Against that background, the pronouncements by the Soviet parliamentarians sounded particularly convincing. Displaying genuine commitment to strengthening peace and international security, they revealed the true nature of Washington's plans to spread the arms race to space. It was stressed that these plans and the buildup of nuclear arsenals on earth pose a threat to mankind and to the United States itself. At the same time, the attention of the U.S. participants in the discussion was drawn to the obvious discrepancy between the recent plethora of pronouncements by U.S. officials and the task of creating a favorable atmosphere for the upcoming Geneva talks between the USSR and the United States on space and nuclear armaments, a task that meets both countries' interests. It is necessary, the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation members stressed, to unswervingly observe the spirit and letter of the 8 January Geneva joint Soviet-American statement on the subject and objectives of the aforementioned talks.

Speaking during the discussion, V. V. Shcherbitskiy said that the main efforts of the USSR and the United States should be directed toward averting through joint efforts the threat of nuclear war. We believe, he said, that this must be done by preventing an arms race in space and stopping it on earth.

As is known, Soviet-American talks will soon begin on these questions in Geneva, the Soviet delegation head continued.

That is why we ought to look for ways and means of creating a favorable atmosphere for the talks. We assume that the U.S. Congress knows that the Soviet Union has put forward a number of measures that could considerably promote the success of the talks and the achievement of the ultimate aim of our efforts--the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Statements by K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, have specifically mentioned such steps as the reaching of an agreement between the USSR and the United States to adhere in their relations to certain norms; bringing into effect the 1974 treaty between the USSR and the United States on limiting underground nuclear weapon tests and the 1976 treaty between the USSR and the United States on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes; resuming and bringing to a conclusion talks (they were being held jointly with Britain) aimed at elaborating a treaty on the total and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests; and freezing the nuclear arsenals of all the nuclear powers, with the Soviet Union and the United

States taking the initiative in that area. Without doubt, U.S. willingness to follow the Soviet example and pledge not to use nuclear weapons first would be a major contribution to the strengthening of trust between our countries and would reduce the nuclear danger.

Shcherbitskiy Press Conference

LD071150 Moscow TASS in English 1133 GMT 7 Mar 85

[Excerpts] Washington, March 7 TASS—The delegation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, headed by member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, now on a visit in the United States, continued on Wednesday the exchange of views with a delegation of the House of Representatives of the American Congress. Key problems of our time were discussed: questions of preventing the militarisation of outer space, of the limitation and ending of the arms race. During the discussion many American congressmen, expressing the American people's concern over the tense situation in the world, expressed agreement with the Soviet members of parliament that the easing of international tension, normalisation and improvement of Soviet-American relations is the paramount task at present.

A press conference was held after the discussion. Speaking at it, the head of the Soviet delegation Vladimir Shcherbitskiy said in part:

Recently Konstantin Chernenko clearly formulated our principled and consistent stand in the field of foreign policy.

Firstly: We do not seek any one-sided advantages.

Secondly: We want termination, and not continuation of the arms race.

And thirdly: We want a real reduction in the stockpiled armaments and destruction of a considerable part of them, to begin with, and not the creation of new and new system of weapons. Our ultimate goal in this is full destruction of nuclear weapons everywhere in the world and complete removal of the threat of nuclear war.

An immense responsibility in the attainment of this goal rests with both our countries--the Soviet Union and the United States, Vladimir Shcherbitskiy stated.

What is needed, in our view, for the normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations? It is necessary, first of all, that they be not oriented towards confrontation. However, what is being done by the U.S. side in the military field in recent years is regarded by the Soviet Union quite unequivocally. That is an attempt to achieve a decisive military superiority and to ensure conditions which would enable the United States to deliver a first nuclear strike with an eye to impunity.

I shall refer to the so-called "strategic defence initiative". Our attitude to it, I think, is well known to you. We firmly oppose the plans aimed at spreading the arms race to outer space.

The Soviet leadership unswervingly pursues a line towards preventing an arms race in outer space and towards ending it on earth. It was precisely from this principled position that the Soviet Union offered to the United States to enter into new talks on the entire complex of nuclear and space arms.

We regard as fundamentally important the agreement reached at the meeting between Andrey Gromyko and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, the agreement which, in our view, opens up an opportunity for serious resultative talks in Geneva. Of course they will be successful only if the agreement on the subject and objectives of the talks is honoured in every part of it and if the principle of parity and equal security is strictly observed.

Comment on SDI

LD071631 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Mar 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "V. V. Shcherbitskiy's Speech"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 7 Mar (TASS)—Our countries have proved in practice that they can cooperate in resolving the most difficult problems. We have this experience and it must be valued. There is the 1963 agreement on halting nuclear tests in the three spheres, the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the 1972 treaty on limiting antimissile defense, and the agreement on limiting strategic weapons. All these are convincing examples showing that the United States and the USSR can act fruitfully together in the cause of curbing the nuclear arms race and in the cause of averting nuclear war.

This is also indicated by such important Soviet-U.S. documents as "Foundations of Interrelations Between the USSR and United States" and the agreement on averting nuclear war, elaborated in 1972 and 1973 respectively.

An approach from a "position of strength" is totally unacceptable. It is high time to admit that neither side can or should strive to achieve military superiority no matter what name it is given: antimissile, or strictly defensive "shield," or anything else. Such an aspiration is simply chasing illusions. Apart from that it is extremely dangerous because it leads to stepping up of the arms race and destabilization of the entire international situation.

An incontrovertible truth of the nuclear age is that the arms race cannot really safeguard anyone's security. Strict observance of the principle of equality and mutual security is essential for normal relations. Of course, this assumes that the sides are willing to make sensible compromises. That is the only possible approach.

Finally, and this is very important, normal relations can only be built on a basis of noninterference in each other's internal affairs, respect for the laws and ways of the other country.

These are elementary truths of international relations and the Soviet Union adheres strictly to these principles. The world would undoubtedly be a safer place to live right now if the U.S. side would consistently adhere to a similar approach. However, the actions of the U.S. side in the military sphere in recent years are taken by the Soviet Union as meaning just one thing: It is attempting to achieve decisive military superiority and guarantee for itself conditions allowing it to deliver a first nuclear strike while counting on going unpunished. Perhaps these are strong expressions but they are the result of a realistic appraisal of the political and military measures as well as other actions on the part of the United States.

Let me refer to the so-called strategic defense initiative. Our attitude to it is, I think, well known to you. We resolutely oppose plans to proliferate the arms race in space, and this is by no means because the Soviet Union has nothing with which to counter these plans.

As Konstantin Chernenko, the head of our state, has said: If we are compelled to do so we will do everything--as was the case on more than one occasion in the past--to safeguard the security of our country as well as the security of our allies and friends.

But will the security of the United States become more reliable as a result of this, and will they gain anything? Quite plainly, the answer is no.

What would be the consequences of preparations for "star wars"? One thing is perfectly clear: It would mean an understanding of the whole process of arms limitation and reduction. Implementation of these plans would nullify all the positive things achieved in the seventies and, first and foremost, would undermine the termless Soviet-American treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems.

What follows, then? Surely there is more on the horizon than the sinister prospect of an uncontrolled arms race in all directions? This can never be permitted!

The Soviet leadership is steadily pursuing a line toward preventing an arms race in outer space and toward terminating it on earth. Proceeding from precisely this principled position, the Soviet Union has proposed to the United States entering into new talks on the whole complex of nuclear and space armaments.

We consider the accord reached at the meeting between Andrey Gromyko and G. Shultz, the secretary of state, to be of fundamental importance. In our view it opens up the possibility for serious fruitful talks in Geneva. Of course, they will be successful only if the accord on the subject and aims of the talks is kept in all its parts, and if the principle of equality and mutual security is strictly observed.

We do not want talks for the sake of talks. They must not be a screen for a continuation of the arms race. The Soviet delegation at Geneva has been given clear instructions to work for an agreement on the complex of space and nuclear weapons. We expect the United States to join us in the search for a mutually acceptable agreement.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that the problem of preventing war is of the most important, priority significance.

As Konstantin Chernenko said recently: "It is a matter of a problem which overshadows, one might say, all the rest. That is, the problem of how to ward off the threat of nuclear war and find a way to check the arms race, and create a situation in the world in which people will not fear for tomorrow. On this matter, delay is intolerable." And the chance that exists today must not be allowed to slip by.

Allow me to express the hope that today's meeting will further our efforts to improve Soviet-U.S. relations and create a favorable international situation leading to the establishment of lasting peace on earth.

V. V. Shcherbitskiy, B. I. Stukalin, and other members of the Soviet delegation replied to correspondents' questions.

Meeting With Reagan

LD080017 Moscow TASS in English 0006 GMT 8 Mar 85

[Text] Washington March 8 TASS--A meeting has been held in the White House between Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, who arrived in the USA at the head of a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

The meeting covered questions pertaining to the upcoming Soviet-American talks on nuclear and outer space weapons and other questions of Soviet-American relations.

On the same day U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz gave a dinner in honour of the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet currently staying in the United States at the invitation of the U.S. Congress.

Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, head of the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, exchanged speeches.

Further Comment to Congressmen on SDI

PM111447 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Mar 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation's Visit to Washington"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 8 Mar--The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by V. V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, member of

the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, has met with a group of U.S. congressmen led by Speaker of the House of Representatives T. O'Neill.

V. V. Shcherbitskiy addressed the meeting.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's visit to Washington is drawing to a close, the head of the Soviet delegation said. The days we have spent in our country's capital have followed a businesslike and very full program. We have discussed the most diverse aspects of Soviet-American relations and international problems.

However complex and aggravated the contemporary international situation may be, there are now, in our opinion, real chances to rectify the situation as a result of the upcoming Soviet-American talks. These chances must not be missed.

It is important for a constructive tone to be adopted right from the start at the USSR-U.S. talks in Geneva so that progress can be made toward resolving the questions which, according to the Soviet-American accord, are the subject and goal of the talks. The Soviet side is ready for this and will adhere firmly to this course.

Let us say frankly that anyone who supposes that it is possible to secure decisive military superiority by building up the arms race and extending it to space is deeply mistaken. The militarization of space will not only whip up an uncontrolled arms race, but will also effectively mean the end of the process of limiting and reducing nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union does not oppose the extension of the arms race to space because it will be unable to respond to this. "If we are forced to do so," K. U. Chernenko stressed in this connection, "we will do everything, as we have done repeatedly in the past, to protect our security and the security of our allies and friends."

History has brought mankind to a decisive point in its development. The very fate of civilization depends on whether or not the key problems facing the world are resolved.

We are firmly convinced that, in the interests of Soviet and American people and in the interests of world peace, a resolute breakthrough in the present relations between our countries and a switch to constructive and mutually advantageous cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union are necessary.

CSO: 5200/1026

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TALKS DISCUSSED IN 7 MAR POLITBURO SESSION

PM081138 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Mar 85 First Edition p 1

[Excerpts] In the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee: At its routine session, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee examined the results of the elections to the supreme soviets of the union and autonomous republics and to the local soviets of people's deputies which took place on 24 February 1985. As was noted at the session, these elections were a major event in the socio-political life of the country and an important mobilizing factor in the preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress. They represented a convincing victory by the bloc of communists and nonparty members and demonstrated the unshakable cohesion of the Soviet people around the Communist Party and the unanimous support for its domestic and foreign policy.

The Politburo examined and approved the directives for the USSR delegation to the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments that begin on 12 March. In this respect it was stressed that the talks open up an opportunity, given the sides' mutual readiness for this, to avert the spread of the arms race to outer space, to halt it on earth, and thereby to take a big step towards solving an historic task: the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere. The Soviet side will act energetically and constructively at the talks, proceeding from the principle of equality and equal security and strictly guided by the 8 January 1985 agreement that the questions of nuclear and space arms must be considered and resolved in their interrelationship.

The Politburo heard and approved a report by Comrade Gromyko on his visits to Italy and Spain. It was noted that as an outcome of the talks that were held with the leaders of these states and that were focused on key problems of European and international life, a certain closeness of the positions of the USSR, Italy, and Spain had appeared with regard to the urgent need for effective efforts to remove the threat of nuclear war and to ease international tension. Of importance in this regard is the support they give to the accord on the subject and aims of the forthcoming talks between the USSR and the United States on questions of space and nuclear weapons. The confirmation by the Italian and Spanish leadership of their intention to consistently broaden businesslike cooperation, including political contacts, with the Soviet Union fully coincides with the approach of the Soviet side.

Information by Comrade Gromyko on the results of his talks with Genscher, federal vice chancellor and foreign minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, was approved. In this regard, it was noted at the Politburo session that the Soviet leadership is in favor of developing mutually advantageous cooperation with the FRG on the basis of the 1970 Moscow Treaty and other Soviet-West German agreements. At the same time it was stressed once more that the main, determining element in the USSR's relations with the FRG has been and remains questions of security.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON GENEVA DELEGATION NOTED

LD071506 Moscow TASS in English 1250 GMT 7 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow March 7 TASS -- Follow brief biographical data on the members of the Soviet delegation for the USSR-USA talks on nuclear and space arms. The talks are to begin in Geneva on March 12.

The leader of the delegation:

Ambassador Viktor Karpov was born on October 9, 1928. In 1951 he graduated from the Moscow State Institute for International Relations. From 1951 he engaged in scientific work. From 1955 -- a staff member of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. From 1962 to 1966 worked with the USSR Embassy in the USA.

Participated in the Soviet-U.S. Salt-1 and Salt-2 talks. In 1978 he headed the USSR delegation at the Salt-2 talks. In 1982-1983 he headed the USSR delegation at the talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms.

He has a degree of Candidate of Science (law).

He is married and has a daughter.

Member of the delegation

Ambassador Yuliy Kvitsinskiy was born on September 28, 1936. He graduated from the Moscow State Institute for International Relations in 1959 and since then is a staff member of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. From 1959 to 1965 he worked with the USSR Embassy in the GDR and in 1978-1981 with the Soviet Embassy in the FRG.

He took part in the quadri-partite talks on West Berlin as well as in the Vienna negotiations. In 1981-1983 he headed the USSR delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe.

He has a degree of Candidate of Science (law).

He is married and has two children.

Member of the delegation

Ambassador Aleksey Obukhov was born on November 12, 1937. After graduating from the Moscow State Institute for International Relations in 1961, he engaged in scientific

work. He has been on the staff of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs since 1965. In 1965-1966 he worked in the USSR Embassy in Thailand.

He participated in the Soviet-U.S. Salt-1 and Salt-2 talks as well as in the talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms.

He has a degree of Candidate of Science (history).

He is married and has two children.

CSO: 5200/1028

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FINNISH OFFICIAL: NEGATIVE SECURITY PLEDGES INADEQUATE

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 13 Mar 85 p 27

[Article by Lauri Karen]

[Text] Geneva—At the Geneva Disarmament Conference on Tuesday Finland asserted that the so-called negative security guarantees given those nations that do not have nuclear weapons by those that do are inadequate as things are at present.

By guarantees are meant the nuclear powers' promise to refrain from using nuclear weapons against those nations without them and from threatening them with such weapons.

Speaking for Finland, Undersecretary of State Klaus Tornudd referred to the development of military technology, primarily cruise missiles, without, however, mentioning them by name.

Because of them, negative security guarantees should also be extended to the indirect threat of nuclear weapons, that is, to cases in which the air space of nations without nuclear weapons might be used in violation of the provisions of international law to strike targets located elsewhere.

Such use of air space should be prohibited.

"The current negative security guarantees do not fully eliminate this problem," Tornudd said. "In Finland's opinion, they should be developed in the direction of full-authorization procedures so that nations without nuclear weapons would be assured the absolute right to remain outside of any political speculations of a strategic nature."

Sweden and Austria expressed the same kind of views at the disarmament conference.

The Geneva Disarmament Conference is a body that functions within the framework of the United Nations for the purpose of multilateral negotiations on disarmament. It has nothing to do with bilateral U.S.-USSR arms control negotiations.

11,466
CSD: 5200/2518

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

LEUSCHNER VIEWS EAST-WEST CONTACTS PRIOR TO GENEVA

DW042110 East Berlin Domestic Service in German 1800 GMT 4 Mar 85

[Guenter Leuschner's weekly international review]

[Excerpt] Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko in Italy and Spain, a representative Soviet parliamentary group in the United States, talks between the SED and the SPD as well as between Hermann Axen and FRG Foreign Minister Genscher, and a working visit by Genscher to Moscow -- this list is by no means complete, but it shows the large number and variety of political activities prior to the Geneva negotiations scheduled to begin one week from now.

In fact, these Soviet-U.S. negotiations are a sort of common reference point for all these talks. In Italy and Spain, Gromyko naturally also discussed bilateral matters with the respective governments. However, Gromyko and his interlocutors were primarily interested in creating as constructive a climate as possible for Geneva. Even though neither the Italians nor the Spaniards, the GDR nor the FRG will sit at the negotiating table, a lot depends on their attitude and stance on the issues to be addressed in Geneva. If a new stage of East-West relations is to come about, all states, including the medium and small states, must make their contribution, as Genscher said prior to his departure for Moscow.

The bourgeois Western press has viewed Gromyko's talks in Rome and Madrid as a publicity campaign for the prevention of space militarization. True, this is a journalistic simplification, but it is not wrong. The fate of the Geneva negotiations depends on the prevention of star wars, as does the chance for a new stage in East-West relations in general, to quote Genscher again. Therefore, it must be in the interests not only of the Soviet Union, but of all Europeans to counter the campaign by certain U.S. politicians for space arms with a campaign of common sense against star wars.

Some people do not like that, and therefore they warn about the Soviet Union's alleged attempt to drive a wedge between the Western allies. This argument is not new, but above all it is wrong. The wedge was driven by those who, regardless of their own allies and their interests, jeopardized the future of the Geneva negotiations before they had even begun. The argument is also wrong because the Soviet Union would prefer to hold direct talks with the United States and in this way bring about sensible dialogue, businesslike cooperation, and particularly disarmament.

This is the main purpose of the Soviet parliamentarians' visit to Washington and will be high on the agenda of the talks with U.S. Congressmen, and naturally of the planned meeting with Reagan as well. When the delegation arrived, Politburo member Shcherbitskiy said that progress in Soviet-U.S. relations was not only important in itself, but would also have positive effects on the international climate.

Because the vital issues of security for all states are on the agenda in Geneva, the negotiations can become the starting point of a change in international relations. For this very reason, all states must act responsibly so as not to miss this chance again. At the Geneva Disarmament Committee last week, the Soviet Union stated its readiness to discontinue all nuclear arms tests on the basis of reciprocity, even before a respective agreement has been signed. Would it not be in the interests of all states, including nonnuclear states, to strongly support such a step as an accompaniment to the Geneva negotiations?

Now, let us take the talks between the SED and the SPD on the creation of a chemical weapons-free zone in Europe. According to statements by both sides, the fourth working meeting that has just ended has largely brought about agreement. If this is possible between two parties, why should it not be possible between two governments? In addition, would not such an agreement at this time be a clear signal of the two German states' readiness to make a contribution of their own to the improvement of the international climate? Reference to the negotiations on a worldwide ban of chemical weapons does not help anyone, because, first, these negotiations are stagnating and, second, an initial partial solution would make the overall solution -- the banning of all chemical weapons -- easier.

CSO: 5200/3016

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

HONECKER EXPRESSES SUPPORT FOR USSR ARMS STANCE

LD101843 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1646 GMT 10 Mar 85

[Text] Leipzig, 10 Mar (ADN) -- The protection of peace is the only alternative to confrontation and arms buildup. Erich Honecker stressed this in his toast at the traditional reception in the Soviet pavilion at the fair. The USSR, the CPSU and Comrade Konstantin Chernenko will perform indefatigable work, full of initiative, in the interest of mankind for the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe.

"The people connect many expectations and hopes for positive results with the Soviet-American negotiations beginning in Geneva in a few days," Erich Honecker said. The GDR supports fully and completely the view of the USSR that it is important to achieve concrete measures on arms limitation and disarmament in these negotiations, on the whole complex of issues in space and nuclear weapons, in order finally to reach the abolition of nuclear weapons altogether.

The GDR, Erich Honecker said, will also in the future work at the side of the USSR to ensure that reason and realism will prevail in international relations and a change for the better is brought about, to which political dialogue performs valuable services. "Open world trade and economic relations on the basis of equal rights and mutual advantages play a peace-promoting role." May the 1985 Leipzig Spring Fair also contribute to this.

Here in Leipzig, the great weight of the USSR as a trade partner in the world of today is proved convincingly. Trade and economic relations with the USSR are for many countries an essential element of their economic development, mainly because this trade is carried out on the basis of equal rights and mutual advantage.

Erich Honecker expressed the certainty that the GDR will succeed in solving all fundamental scientific-technological, economic, and social tasks at the side of the USSR. He pointed to the fact that in 1984 the exchange of goods between both countries amounted to 15 billion rubles and that presently there are more than 200 agreements that embrace all decisive areas of national economic development.

CSO: 5200/3016

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

IMPORTANCE OF GENEVA TALKS STRESSED

LD101856 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1715 GMT 10 Mar 85

[Text] Leipzig, 10 Mar (AN) -- The fate of the world depends to a significant degree on whether there is success in preventing the arms race in space and stopping it on earth. Anatoliy Mayorets, minister of electrical equipment industry of the USSR, stated this in the Soviet pavilion at the traditional reception for the CDR party and state leadership. It is not by chance that the eyes of all people of good will are now directed particularly towards Geneva, where the Soviet-American negotiations on the whole complex issue of space and nuclear weapons will soon begin.

The situation on earth remains complicated and in many respects dangerous. Imperialism, Mayorets said, is replacing the historical competition of the two opposed social systems with psychological warfare. "It is gambling on a confrontation in relations between states, on an arms race without precedent in its dimensions, and on the attainment of military superiority. This policy is hazardous and absolutely without prospects." The socialist fraternal countries will not permit a violation of the military-strategic balance.

The minister emphasized that Leipzig fairs, in the course of many decades, have made their contribution to the consolidation of peace and the development of trade and economic relations between states of different social orders.

CSO: 5200/3016

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GDR DAILY PREVIEWS PROSPECTS FOR GENEVA TALKS

LD121644 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0445 GMT 12 Mar 85

[Text] Berlin, 12 Mar (ADN) -- "In Geneva the Future of Mankind Is at Stake" is the headline in today's NEUES DEUTSCHLAND commentary on the new negotiations between the USSR and the United States on nuclear and space weapons which begin today.

The commentary states: "Since they are concerned with the most important issue affecting all peoples of earth, namely, averting the danger of a nuclear inferno and the lasting protection of peace, great expectations are attached to these negotiations all over the world. There is no reasonable alternative to a positive result to these negotiations.

"The development of mass destruction weapons has long since passed the point beyond which any new war could any longer be evaluated in terms of winners and losers. Anyone who does not understand this would scarcely be in a position to recognize his error in a crisis. Humanity today faces the danger of self-destruction if it does not manage to end the arms race and turn to disarmament. Therefore, the peoples expect, they demand, that in Geneva the door be pushed open which leads in this direction, the secure way to a peaceful future for mankind."

It continues: "Both the complicated nature of the material on the negotiating table and the differing stances of the Soviet Union and the United States on it, prevent one from expecting miracles overnight. However, if both sides approach that which their foreign ministers agreed to concerning the negotiations, in their own interest, correctly understood, and conscious of their responsibility to all mankind, then a positive result in Geneva is indeed possible."

NEUES DEUTSCHLAND writes that the goal of the negotiations, the working out of effective agreements which are directed toward preventing the arms race in space and ending it on earth, toward the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms and the consolidation of strategic stability, agrees "fully and completely with the vital interests and the will of the peoples of our planet." The newspaper notes: "The peace forces on all continents who, like the citizens of the GDR, see themselves confirmed in the correctness of their striving, regard the negotiations as an impulse to now stand up even more decisively, with even greater coordination and effectiveness for common goals."

NEUES DEUTSCHLAND draws attention to the fact that in the international public there are many worried voices, "which, in particular, draw attention to Washington's insistence on the space weapons project, although the prevention of the arms race in space is uppermost among the objectives agreed upon for Geneva."

The newspaper continues: "Precisely in light of the forthcoming 40th anniversary of victory and the liberation of the peoples from Hitlerite fascism, it must be stressed: The Geneva negotiations offer a great chance to use the lessons of World War II for the prevention of a third world war. Among these lessons is also the fact that speculations with regard to attaining military superiority over the Soviet Union are built on sand. The principle of equality and equal security alone can be the basis for any agreements reached in Geneva. As far as the militarization of space striven for by certain forces is concerned, our position is clear and logical: The point at which weapons systems are installed in places where they do not yet exist must be avoided. There must be no arms race in space, and it must be ended on earth. The existing approximate military balance must be maintained in the realization of disarmament measures at an ever lower level and with ever fewer weapons."

CSO: 5200/3016

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET POSITIONS ALLOW FAR-REACHING AGREEMENTS

LD120613 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 2140 GMT 11 Mar 85

[Commentary by Guenter Leuschner]

[Text] On the eve of the start of the Geneva negotiations it is hardly necessary to waste many words on the importance of this event.

When in January the foreign ministers of the two states found a new starting point, a way out of the deadlock, which arose as a result of the deployment of the American first-strike weapons in Western Europe, the general sigh of relief in the world was so palpable that this alone said enough about the hopes, desires, and expectations linked with Geneva.

What begins tomorrow are not just any negotiations; more depends on their outcome than on previous talks, and this was repeatedly expressed in almost all commentaries in the prelude to Geneva. The responsibility begins with the strict observance of what was agreed to in regard to the goals and subject of the Geneva negotiations. These are the prevention of a militarization of space and the reduction of strategic and so-called medium-range weapons; this means discussion of these three subjects in their reciprocal effects. This is exactly what is contained in the Geneva agreement. This is why both participants have sent a delegation with three subgroups to Geneva and not, for example, three independent delegations.

The Soviet Union has left no doubt that it will adhere to this agreement, in both form and content. Its basic stance for Geneva is clear. It will work to achieve a treaty that prohibits any deployment of weapons in space. This is its first objective and it is also the key question of the whole negotiations. No one can see an arms race in space in isolation from the military situation on earth. This, moreover, was recently conceded by American Defense Secretary Weinberger himself when he spoke of the danger for the United States that would arise if the Soviet Union had the space plans whose realization the United States is working on. To remove space from the whole complex of the three subjects of the negotiations would not only contradict the agreements between the two states, but would also contradict all logic and all sense of reality. It is this very topic that could be the easiest to solve in Geneva. There are no weapons in space yet, and as we know, it is always easier to prohibit that which does not exist.

The space treaty agreed on years ago, which at least bans deployment of mass destruction weapons in space, would, moreover, be a basis to easily elaborate a comprehensive ban on militarization, including verification, without any great difficulty. If, in addition, both sides adhered to the 1972 treaty on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems the subject of space could be settled in Geneva without any particular difficulty. As far as strategic arms are concerned, the so-called intercontinental weapons, the Soviet Union's basic stance has also been clear for a long time. It was not the Soviet Union's fault that SALT II, which froze these strategic arms and which led to the initial scrapping of 250 missiles, did not come into force. In addition, the Soviet Union is prepared to reduce the existing strategic arms literally by any amount to which the other side is also prepared. This could be 10, 20, or 30 percent -- indeed, even complete abolition. It is thus entirely up to the United States to decide on the figure, but of course the principle of equal security must be observed. Because the United States has 80 percent of its strategic weapons deployed on ships and aircraft and the Soviet Union, on the other hand, about 80 percent of equivalent weapons deployed on land, one side cannot demand the reduction of just one kind of weapon, as the United States did at the earlier Geneva negotiations when it wanted to almost completely exclude its sea- and air-based strategic weapons from possible reduction.

A just solution naturally requires equally balanced reduction of all systems, which, given goodwill, would also be possible because the two states possess parity in these weapons.

The Soviet Union is also prepared to eliminate all medium-range weapons if the other side wants this. Neither side should have one missile or one warhead more than the other -- this fully justified basic negotiating principle of the Soviet Union at the previous negotiations will retain its validity now in Geneva, as well.

It must be taken into account that the Pershings already deployed are strategic weapons for the Soviet Union and, in contrast to the Soviet medium-range weapons, which cannot reach the territory of the United States, they threaten the military and political centers of the USSR. Here, too, there is a direct interaction that makes integrated negotiation necessary.

The enumeration of the Soviet Union's basic views shows that far-reaching agreements in all three subjects of negotiation are possible and that the Soviet side is trying to achieve them with all its strength.

CSO: 5200/3016

U.S-USSR GENEVA TALKS

KAEUBLER CONDEMNS SENATE APPROVAL OF MX FUNDING

LD211001 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 1606 GMT 20 Mar 85

[Horst Kaeubler commentary]

[Text] Last night the U.S. Senate made an alarming decision. By a 55-45 vote, the Senate decided in favor of the production of a further 21 MX intercontinental missiles. Next week the House of Representatives is to vote on the issue. Horst Kaeubler comments on the consequences of this decision.

[Kaeubler] President Reagan is celebrating a victory. But what kind of a victory? Under massive pressure from the White House, the Senate approved the core of the Reagan administration's nuclear arms program -- \$1.5 billion for a further 21 MX intercontinental missiles. In December, the first MX, which Senator Gary Hart describes as a potential first-strike weapon, are to be stationed in the state of Wyoming. What motivates this President, who assures us that he is working in negotiations to create a world without nuclear weapons, to allow the production of the most dangerous generation yet of offensive nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons equipped with 10 multiple warheads each, which are independently targetable and are in many ways more accurate?

Oh no, the President is not embarrassed when he has to explain why, despite the Geneva negotiations, such huge amounts of money go into arms production. The explanation we get from the White House is quite simple: A further 21 MX missiles should be seen as a message of American determination to the world. For one cannot allow oneself to be pressured by the Soviet negotiating partner in Geneva. A negative outcome to the vote in the Senate would have been a catastrophe to the American delegation in Geneva.

Who is under pressure? So far, all we know is that the Soviet Union is pressing for a renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons, for an agreement on the renunciation of force, for a freeze on nuclear weapons as a first step, and for a ban on space weapons. Gary Hart, the former democratic presidential candidate, made remarks at the time of the Senate vote which give food for thought. He said that it seems the President only entered into the new disarmament negotiations in order to secure an MX victory in Congress. Even during his state visit to Canada, the President called senators in order to influence their decision on the MX, and just before the vote the President went to Capitol Hill to prevent a defeat.

Isn't the obvious intention behind these new MX missiles to complement the U.S. nuclear first-strike potential along with the new sea-based Trident submarine missiles and the B-1 nuclear bomber? When at the beginning of the year Andrey Gromyko and George Shultz agreed on the joint Soviet-American statement which forms the basis

of the Geneva negotiations which have now begun, a quite different line of approach was set out -- reduction of nuclear weapons potential, prevention of a new round in the arms race, more security through fewer weapons. President Reagan likes to project himself as a man for whom religious principles are paramount. Even U.S. church dignitaries have addressed a strong appeal to him to adhere to moral principles -- the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe. After 300 Catholic bishops opposed the MX missile last week, the bishops of the Methodist Church, the third largest religious community in the United States, yesterday rejected the MX missiles as a weapon which raises the probability of a nuclear war.

Would it not be appropriate now, when Geneva provides the opportunity of reaching effective disarmament agreements on the basis of the Soviet-American statement, to demonstrate extreme restraint in the production of new nuclear weapons so as not to burden the climate of the talks? But the massive pressure exercised by the administration in order to railroad the MX decision through the Senate, and next week through the House of Representatives, raises serious, very serious, questions.

CSO: 5200/3016

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

XINHUA ON U.S.-USSR ARMS TALKS IN GENEVA

FRG's Kohl 'Optimistic'

OW130243 Beijing XINHUA in English 0216 GMT 13 Mar 85

[Text] Bonn, March 12 (XINHUA) -- Chancellor Helmut Kohl, in an interview with the West German pictorial QUICK, today said he was "cautiously optimistic" about the U.S.-U.S.S.R. arms control talks opening today in Geneva. In the interview, published in advance by the Federal Press and Information Office, the chancellor said it was possible that the talks would produce fruitful results given the intent on both sides to talk. But he called for patience in view of the deep differences between the two countries. Kohl said the two Germanys, in spite of their differences, are able to contribute to the success of the negotiations. He said he hoped Democratic Germany would exercise its influence within the Warsaw Pact.

Sweden Calls Talks 'Inspiring'

OW230321 Beijing XINHUA in English 0244 GMT 13 Mar 85

[Text] Stockholm, March 12 (XINHUA) -- Sweden hopes the ongoing Geneva talks between the U.S. and the Soviet Union will lead to a breakthrough in the control of nuclear arms on earth and in space. In a declaration, Swedish Foreign Minister Lennart Bodstrom today said that the Geneva talks, which aim to improve relations between two nuclear superpowers, are inspiring. He said it is in accordance with Swedish policy to strengthen strategic stability. He expressed hope that the talks would lead to better international cooperation and make the world a safer place.

Third Session Held

OW191931 Beijing XINHUA in English 1854 GMT 19 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva, March 19 (XINHUA) -- The U.S. and Soviet negotiators held their third session of arms talks here today to seek the way to move forward on discussing the separate issues of strategic, intermediate and space weaponry.

Officials said that the plenary session at the Soviet mission lasted two hours and 40 minutes. It was attended by the three senior negotiators on either side -- for the United States, Max Kampelman, John G. Tower and Maynard W. Glitman and for the Soviet Union, Viktor Karpov, Yuli Kvitsinsky and Aleksey Obukhov.

Today's session came after the sharp public exchanges between the superpowers during the four-day recess on their fresh efforts to control nuclear missiles and space-based weapons.

During the weekend, chief Soviet negotiator Viktor Karpov speaking on Soviet television accused the United States of trying to back away from an earlier agreement by giving "lectures" at Geneva about the alleged benefits of space weapons rather than agreeing to negotiate seriously for their elimination.

However, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz later responded sharply to Karpov's remarks, saying that "if that kind of performance is to mean that the Soviets approach those negotiations as propaganda opportunities then that doesn't bode very well for the negotiations."

Another full session of the talks is reportedly scheduled for March 21 at the U.S. mission.

Further Report

OW200758 Beijing XINHUA in English 0707 GMT 20 Mar 85

["Differences Mount on Method of U.S.-Soviet Arms Talks" -- XINHUA headline]

[Text] Geneva, March 19 (XINHUA) -- The U.S. and Soviet negotiators met today in the third session of arms talks but failed to agree on how the negotiations should proceed.

After three-hour session at the Soviet mission here, the U.S. and Soviet negotiators did not resolve their differences on the constitution and relations of the working groups.

According to a previous agreement, the two delegations will each form three groups to discuss one of the three weaponry categories strategic arms, intermediate-range missiles and space weapons.

The U.S. negotiators have stated that they want the negotiations to be carried out on a category-by-category basis. They do not want progress in a given area of talks to necessarily imply or require headway in the two others.

The Soviets have insisted that the discussions on all three types of weaponry be linked. They will not agree to advances to a settlement in any single area if there is no progress on the other two arms reduction issues, particularly space weapons.

The two delegations are scheduled to meet again Thursday at the U.S. mission.

No Breakthrough Seen

OW230911 Beijing XINHUA in English 0843 GMT 23 Mar 85

["News Analysis: An Unfavorable Beginning at Geneva (Ren Zhengde)" -- XINHUA headline]

[Text] Geneva, March 23 (XINHUA) -- Although U.S. and Soviet arms control negotiators finally agreed on Thursday to talk in working groups on separate categories next week, Soviet officials predicted that the talks are not likely to enter a substantial stage before summer.

The procedural agreement was reached at the fourth working session between the two delegations since U.S.-Soviet arms talks resumed here on March 12.

In the last three sessions, the two sides were preoccupied with the procedural issue because it relates to their basic negotiating strategies.

In early January, the foreign ministers of the two countries decided that their negotiators would be divided into three working groups discussing the issues of space weapons, strategic arsenals and medium-range nuclear missiles. The three negotiations are to be linked with each other. However, each side clearly has its own intentions and explanations in this matter.

The Soviet Union intended to take advantage of this linkage to knock down the U.S. "star wars" program proposed by President Ronald Reagan, stressing that the talks on these three arms categories cannot be separated and that the issues should be resolved simultaneously.

Soviet negotiators also noted that if no results come out of the talks on the limitation of space weapons, no agreements can be expected from the other two sessions.

The United States contended that the issue of space weapons can be negotiated but it will not abandon its plans in this area. While laying emphasis on the reduction of offensive nuclear weapons, the U.S. stressed that an agreement in one area is not conditional on the outcome of the other sets of talks.

The two sides also launched a propaganda war. After the first week of their talks, chief Soviet negotiator Viktor P. Karpov accused the United States of intending to change the negotiation programs and objectives. He also criticized the U.S. for acting in bad faith on the space arms issue.

He said that U.S. officials are merely giving "lectures" about the supposed advantages of space weapons rather than negotiating seriously for their elimination.

To repudiate the Soviet accusations, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz criticized Karpov for breaching the confidentiality of the talks and running the risk of turning them into a propaganda show.

The U.S. side also accused Karpov of violating the principles the two sides had agreed upon in keeping the development of negotiations in secrecy, adding that the act reflected the Soviets' lack of sincerity toward the negotiations.

While wrangling over the procedure of the talks, both sides have stepped up plans to develop and deploy new nuclear weapons. This has undoubtedly imposed a shadow over their negotiations.

After deploying more than one hundred nuclear missiles in Federal Germany, Britain and Italy, the United States began developing the first 16 cruise missiles in Belgium on March 15. According to NATO plans, Belgium will altogether have 48 nuclear missiles deployed on its territory.

On Wednesday, the U.S. Senate voted for the allocation of 1.5 million U.S. dollars for the building of 21 MX intercontinental missiles that have a range of 6,000 miles. The missiles will be deployed the next spring.

The U.S. Government also announced that it will start testing anti-missile and anti-space weapons in 1987, two years ahead of the original plan.

It is reported that the Soviet Union in the last two months deployed another 18 SS-20 missiles in Eastern Europe, raising the total of 414 from 396 at the beginning of this year. The Soviet Union also started deploying SS-24 and SS-25 intercontinental nuclear missiles and formulated a new plan on speeding up research and development of space weapons.

Considering the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union differ considerably in their stands towards the arms reduction issues, it seems impossible for them to have a breakthrough in their talks.

As the U.S.-Soviet nuclear disarmament talks concern global security, the people of the world have the right to ask the two superpowers to adopt more serious and more sincere attitudes toward their negotiations.

'Star Wars,' Arms Talks

OW231321 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 0738 GMT 21 Mar 85

["International Reference Material: The 'Star Wars' Plan and Space Arms Talks" -- XINHUA headline]

[Excerpts] Beijing, 21 Mar (XINHUA) -- The U.S. Reagan administration's "star wars" plan, as people now call it, is officially known as "the President's strategic defense initiative." It was put forward by U.S. President Reagan in a speech on 23 March 1983.

In the early 1970's, the U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear forces were, by and large, the same in terms of quantity, with the United States leading in missile strike accuracy and in multiwarhead technology. However, since the late 1960's the Soviet Union has developed five different kinds of intercontinental missiles and has now approached the United States in multiwarhead technology and strike accuracy. Consequently, the Soviet Union is now capable, in a first strike, of destroying most U.S. land-based intercontinental missiles as well as a sizable portion of its strategic missile-carrying submarines and strategic bombers, thus threatening U.S. strategic nuclear forces. This makes the United States feel it necessary to build an effective antimissile system to ensure the survival of its strategic nuclear forces and the reliability of its deterrent power. Under such circumstances, the United States regards the above-mentioned plan as a significant measure for repairing its strategic nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union.

The Reagan administration holds that the United States should formulate an overall development plan by fully assuming that a nuclear war could break out. This calls for increasing the nuclear offensive capability and building a defense system against nuclear attacks. By making good preparations, both offensive and defensive, for a nuclear war, the United States will not only have a reliable deterrent power but will also put itself in an invincible position once a nuclear war breaks out. This is the main guiding thought with which Reagan proposed the above-mentioned plan.

For this large-scale plan, which involves a great variety of sophisticated science and technology, President Reagan has requested that an appropriation totaling \$76 billion be made within 5 years. In 1984, close to \$1 billion was appropriated for this purpose. In the meantime, more than 1,000 American scientists have plunged into the research.

design, and manufacturing work. In the first half of last year, the U.S. authorities appointed Air Force Lieutenant General Abrahamson to be responsible for this plan, which, if realized after all, will have an immense impact on the international situation. Nonetheless, the plan is still in the exploratory stage at this time, and whether some new space weapon can be formally developed is still a question that cannot be answered until around the 1990's. Moreover, there is strong opposition within the United States. Nevertheless, the U.S. authorities regard this plan as a "trump card" against the Soviet deterrent force; therefore, they made public the text of the plan on 2 January -- the eve of the last Geneva talks between the two sides.

In the face of the "star wars" plan, the Soviet authorities have likewise increased their tempo of research in this field and have deployed antisatellite weapons aimed at low orbit satellites in order to be prepared for "star wars." Last January at the U.S.-Soviet Geneva talks, the Soviet Union stressed that banning "space militarization" would be a "key question" for arms talks in the future. Its purpose was to knock out the "star wars" plan being implemented by the United States. This was because the Soviet Union started earlier than the United States in developing space weapons, but in the past few years the latter made some breakthroughs in experimenting with the antisatellite and antimissile weapons systems. Greatly concerned over the possibility of overall U.S. superiority in space weapons in the near future, the Soviet Union has made every effort to halt the trend of U.S. development in this field.

On the other hand, the United States is trying to limit Soviet development of nuclear missiles, especially land-based intercontinental missiles. Therefore, while agreeing with the Soviet Union to include the space weapons issue in the talks, the United States had demanded that the emphasis of the talks be placed on limiting strategic nuclear arms, in particular, land-based intercontinental missiles. Owing to their respective needs, both sides made some compromises at the January Geneva talks. They finally decided that in the arms control talks, the issues of space weapons and nuclear arms be "incorporated with each other" for panel discussions.

CSSR, GDR Welcome Talks

OW230845 Beijing XINHUA in English 0649 GMT 23 Mar 85

[Text] Prague, March 22 (XINHUA) -- Czechoslovakia and Democratic Germany have welcomed the current Soviet-U.S. Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms.

In a joint communique issued here today, Lubomir Strougal, Czechoslovak premier and Willi Stoph, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Democratic Germany, said they support the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the subjects and aims of the negotiation and Moscow's approach to the Geneva talks.

The communique voiced the hope that the United States would make a positive contribution to the talks in a realistic and constructive manner so as to pave the way for total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The two prime ministers expressed their countries' readiness to work for reducing world tension and removing the danger of nuclear war. They advocated the adoption of effective steps in the direction of nuclear and space disarmament.

Stoph ended his three-day visit to Czechoslovakia today. During the stay here, he met President Gustav Husak and held talks with Strougal on bilateral and world issues.

Poland's Jaruzelski Comments

OW230756 Beijing XINHUA in English 0724 GMT 23 Mar 85

[Text] Warsaw, March 22 (XINHUA) -- Polish leader Wojciech Jaruzelski said here today he hoped the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Geneva talks would promote the reduction of arms arsenals.

He made the remark today in a meeting with Federal German Minister of Economics Martin Bangemann, who came here to attend the fifth session of the Polish-Federal German Commission for Economic, Industrial and Technological Cooperation.

He said he hoped the talks would prevent the United States from bringing the arms race into outer space, the Polish News Agency reported.

The Polish leader stressed the "fundamental significance of the inviolability of the post-war European territorial and political reality, which took shape in accordance with the Yalta and Potsdam decisions."

He also stressed the importance of restoring a positive dialogue and detente between the East and the West.

Gorbachev Comments on Expectations

OW221958 Beijing XINHUA in English 1951 GMT 22 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, March 22 (XINHUA) -- Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev stressed here today that the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. Geneva nuclear arms talks depends on whether both countries adhere to their agreement on the contents and goals of the talks.

During a meeting with senior members of the Socialist International, Gorbachev said that both parties to the talks should show sincerity and willingness to make reasonable compromises, and above all, they should abide by the principle of equality and equal security. The Soviet Union is resolutely opposed to any attempt to turn the (Geneva) talks into something to cover up the escalating arms race, he said. Moscow hoped to see an end to the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Europe, Gorbachev said, adding, this will help solve the package problems being discussed in Geneva.

Finnish Prime Minister Kaleva Sorsa, who was in Moscow in his capacity as chairman of the Socialist International Disarmament Consultative Committee, expressed his hope that Moscow and Washington would try by every means to limit and stop the arms race. The representatives of the Socialist International will fly to Washington after their visit here.

U.S. Urged To Show Realism

OW241749 Beijing XINHUA in English 1445 GMT 24 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, March 24 (XINHUA) -- A commentary in PRAVDA today urged the U.S. to show a spirit of realism in the Soviet-American arms control talks in Geneva.

The commentary said that the Soviet Union would abide by the agreed agenda and objectives of the talks and it would judge the intentions of the American side by its

deeds. Judging by the present signs, however, Washington had failed to display a realistic attitude towards the issues discussed in the talks, it said.

It went on to say that the American leaders believed that they could pave the way for their success in the talks and wring concessions from the Soviet Union by starting a new round of arms race and even bringing this race into space. This is "a dangerous illusion", it warned. Any attempt to negotiate with the Soviet Union from "a position of strength" would come to nothing.

Further Report

00180402 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 0914 GMT 13 Mar 85

[Consolidated report by Chen Yongqian: "The Ins and Outs of the U.S.-Soviet Arms Control Negotiations"]

[Excerpts] Beijing, 13 Mar (XINHUA) -- The U.S.-Soviet arms control negotiations opened in Geneva on 12 March. The negotiations were decided on at the U.S.-Soviet foreign ministerial meeting in Geneva last January. Their agenda includes questions concerning strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate range nuclear weapons, and space weapons. As the negotiations on the three issues are interrelated, the negotiations are also called "packaged disarmament talks." As the first new round of arms control negotiations since the suspension in November and December 1983 of the U.S.-Soviet talks on limiting intermediate-range nuclear arms in Europe and on strategic arms reduction, the talks have attracted broad international attention.

Space weapons talks are a new item in the U.S.-Soviet negotiations. At present, when the U.S. and Soviet military powers are generally balanced, whoever achieves superiority in space weapons will control initiatives for future wars. The Soviet Union took an early lead in developing antisatellite weapons systems in space. However, since Reagan proposed his "star wars plan" in March 1983, the United States has conducted a series of space weapons tests and has achieved rapid breakthroughs in the military technology. The Soviet Union was anxious to limit this development through talks.

On the other hand, the United States, which considers the reduction and limitation of the existing offensive strategic weapons and intermediate-range nuclear weapons as its principal goal, attempted to reduce certain Soviet advantages through negotiations. As a result, both sides made concessions and decided to include the three kinds of weapons in the new talks for discussion.

In view of the fruitless end of the past single-item negotiations and the increasing complex nature of the current "packaged disarmament talks," it is predictable that the negotiations will be protracted. The vast numbers of peace-loving people of the world all wish the United States and the Soviet Union to carry out genuine arms reduction and not try to achieve nuclear superiority under the cover of negotiations or to harm the security and interests of other countries.

CSO: 5200/4006

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

DEMONSTRATORS RALLY IN GENEVA AGAINST ARMS RACE

OW130921 Beijing XINHUA in English 0645 GMT 13 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva, March 12 (XINHUA) -- European women's groups and members of the international ecology organization "Greenpeace" demonstrated here today against the arms race on the occasion of the U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks.

Among those demonstrating were Federal Germany's Greens Party leader Petra Kelly, and Bruce Kent, leader of the British "Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament." Some demonstrators climbed to the top of a 30-meter crane facing the Soviet mission where the talks took place. They affixed a banner on the crane reading, "Put words into action, stop nuclear testing now."

A communique issued by "Greenpeace" said, "It is time for the superpowers to show their willingness to stop the arms race and all nuclear experiments."

CSO: 5200/4006

SPACE ARMS

IMPORTANCE OF STOPPING SPACE MILITARIZATION STRESSED

AU190401 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN' in Russian No 3, Mar 85 (Signed to Press 19 Feb 85) pp 3-12

[Article by A. Platonov: "Towards the Talks in Geneva"]

[Text] The end of 1984 and beginning of 1985 were marked by an important event in world politics—the reaching of agreement between the USSR and the United States on holding talks on nuclear and space weapons. Both sides have appointed their representatives at the talks, the date on which they will begin has also been agreed on—12 March—and the place—the city of Geneva. In a word, the matter has been set on practical rails.

The news of this has met with a broad, positive response throughout the world. People of good will link the forthcoming talks with hopes for the adoption of effective measures aimed at reducing the threat of war, lessening tension, and strengthening mutual trust between states.

/Of particular significance/ [words between slantlines published in boldface type] in this connection is the agreement between the USSR and the United States on the issue of the subjects and aims of the talks, an agreement worked out at the meeting held on 7-8 January 1985 in Geneva between A. A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR minister of foreign affairs, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz. Recorded in a joint Soviet-American statement, this agreement serves a good basis for constructive discussions and for the preparations of far-reaching decisions in spheres directly connected with the interests of strengthening security throughout the world.

What is the substance of the document within the framework of which the sides are called upon to act the forthcoming talks?

The USSR and the United States have agreed that a complex of problems relating to space and nuclear weapons—both strategic and intermediate-range—will be the subject of the talks and that all these problems will be examined and resolved in their interdependence.

The aim of the talks has also been determined--that of working out effective agreement aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and halting the arms race on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear weapons, and strengthening strategic stability.

The statement emphasizes that the forthcoming talks, and efforts in the sphere of limiting and reducing weapons in general, must lead to the liquidation of nuclear weapons everywhere and in their entirety.

Thus, the most serious problems will be brought up at the talks on the resolving of which the direction of the world situation's future development depends to a considerable extent--either along a path of intensified rivalry in the military sphere or in the direction of stopping and then curtailing the arms race.

The agenda of the talks, and equally the method of examining and resolving the main problems--as a complex and in their mutual connection with one another--attests to the fact that it is a question of a new approach and the beginning of new negotiations. The American side has also qualified it in precisely the same way.

The comprehensive approach consolidated in the statement has principled significance. And it is not simply a question of bookkeeping or the mechanical addition of elements. There is an inner, organic interdependence between the three main groups of problems that will be examined at the talks, an interdependence caused by the objective conditions present.

But there is also a key point here--the issue of space weapons or, to be more precise the issue of preventing an arms race in outer space.

From where has this problem arisen and why is it so topical now? It would seem that there exist and are in effect earlier concluded agreements banning nuclear weapons tests in outer space, the introduction of mass destruction weapons into outer space, and banning influence on outer space as a natural environment for hostile purpose; [phrase as published] that is, agreements aimed at protecting and strengthening the peaceful status of outer space. The open-ended 1972 Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the protocol for it also functions in such a way that the creation, testing, and deployment of anti-missile defense systems or components based in space is banned.

ver, these international agreements have proved to be under threat since the United States declared its plans--in direct conflict with the sense and letter of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missiles Systems--to build a so-called large-scale anti-missile defense system with space-based elements. The American Administration is taking concrete steps to implement these plans: A corresponding organizational structure is being formed, resources are being allocated, contracts are being concluded, scientific research centers have been brought into operation, and tests are being carried out. It must be clearly stated: Were it not for these plans, which Washington strives to elevate to the rank of U.S. state policy's prime task by the end of this century, the problem would not have arisen of including space weapons in the talks and examining them together with problems relating to nuclear weapons.

However, the aforementioned processes have not reached the point where they are irreversible. There are possibilities at present of preventing military rivalry from reaching outer space and thus making outer space a source of terrible danger for people.

While coordinating the subject and aims of the forthcoming talks, the Soviet side firmly raised the question of preventing such a development of events. It was stated that one cannot productively examine and resolve the problems of nuclear weapons without also examining and resolving the problems of outer space. It is clear that if the channel for militarizing outer space is not sealed off, efforts to halt the arms race on earth will simply be reduced to naught. On a concrete level this means that without resolving the problem of preventing the militarization of outer space it would be impossible to count on making radical reductions primarily in the sphere of strategic offensive weapons. Here a natural law would be in operation that was revealed by the sides as early as during the SALT-I negotiations, namely: An arms race in the sphere of strategic defense systems, especially space-based systems, would inevitably give rise to an intensification of military rivalry in all other spheres. It is also impossible to examine and resolve the problem of strategic offensive weapons without considering how the problem of intermediate-range nuclear weapons will be settled. And for a weighty reason—the American Pershing II and cruise missiles, deployed as they are in Western Europe, that is, within reach of objectives on Soviet territory, represent strategic weapons in relation to the USSR. This, incidentally, cannot be said of the Soviet intermediate-range SS-20 missiles over which such a great deal of fuss is being made by American propaganda: These weapons cannot reach the territory of the United States.

Explaining the essence of the interdependence of the problems to be discussed at the forthcoming talks, A. A. Gromyko emphasized in a talk with political observers on 13 January this year: "The problem of strategic nuclear weapons cannot be examined in isolation from outer space. The problem of strategic weapons cannot be examined ... apart from intermediate-range weapons. I do not even need to say that strategic weapons and intermediate-range weapons taken together cannot be examined separately from weapons in outer space."

The agreement reached between the USSR and the United States that the talks will be conducted by one delegation from each of the sides divided into three groups is confirmation and, if one can put it as such, organizational expression of the objective interdependence of the main problems that will be examined at the talks.

How does the Soviet Union concretely propose to resolve the problem of preventing the militarization of outer space? The Soviet works to ensure that the use of force in outer space and from outer space against earth, and also from earth against objectives in outer space is banned forever. Weapons of any kind: conventional, nuclear, laser, particle beam, or any other must not be introduced and deployed in outer space—whether in piloted or non-piloted systems. Space strike weapons based on any principles of operation, any forms of basing, must not be built, tested, or deployed either for use in outer space or for use from outer space against objectives on earth, in the air, or at sea. Such weapons which have already been built must be liquidated.

With such a cardinal resolving of the problem of the non-militarization of outer space the way would open up for vital reductions of nuclear weapons on a mutual basis while strictly observing, of course, the principle of party and equal security. Without preserving the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missiles systems and without banning the militarization of outer space, talks on the problem of nuclear weapons would be deprived of meaning and prospects.

One of the three aspects of the forthcoming talks will be resolving the problem of intermediate-range nuclear weapons. In the joint Soviet-American statement adopted on the results of the January meeting held in Geneva at foreign minister level, the sides unequivocally spoke in favor of reaching agreement envisaging the limitation and reduction of such weapons in this sphere--within the context of the general interdependence of the problems subject to examination.

The necessity for precisely such a resolving of the problem became even more obvious after new American nuclear missiles appeared on the territories of certain countries in Western Europe, transported there in accordance with a NATO decision of December 1979. The deployment of these missiles is aimed at breaking the military parity in Europe and gaining unilateral advantages for the United States and in order to neutralize the increased threat to its security, and also to the security of its allies, the USSR is adopting the necessary measures for restoring the balance. No one will succeed in breaking the existing balance of nuclear forces. But it is also clear that a further rise in the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe would not be in the vital interests of any of the sides. It can do nothing but increase tension and intensify mistrust between states. Consequently, the demands of the broad public for a halt to the further deployment of American missiles and the adoption of measures aimed at radically reducing nuclear weapons in Europe are very well-founded and imbued with concern to strengthen stability and security on European soil.

The Soviet Union's position in this sphere is clear and definite. The Soviet side is in favor of lasting peace in Europe being a reliable link in security for peoples on all continents. In the interests of improving the situation in Europe, at earlier talks held in Geneva the USSR put forward a whole series of far-reaching proposals ensuring a fair solution to the problem of intermediate-range nuclear weapons. However, the Western side proved to be unwilling for this and wrecked the talks.

It is clear that corresponding nuclear weapons in Britain and France cannot be discounted when resolving the problem of intermediate-range nuclear weapons in Europe. These states are members of the North Atlantic Alliance. And it would be highly unjustified if NATO gained a supplement or a bonus, as it were, in the form of the British and French nuclear weapons. It is by no means a question, of course, of Britain and France having to liquidate their nuclear weapons. But they cannot be discounted: if the British and French nuclear weapons are retained, then American weapons must be reduced by an appropriate number.

When determining the correlation of forces in terms of intermediate-range nuclear weapons in the European zone, consideration of such a factor of the strategic situation as the existence of U.S. aircraft carriers has exceptionally great significance. In the course of negotiations which have taken place until now, the Soviet side has taken six American aircraft carriers into account which either cruise in European waters or are located in close proximity to them. But it is a well-known fact that the United States has a total of 14 such ships at its disposal and construction of the 14th is not far from completion. If one takes into account that there are up to 40 aircraft-nuclear weapons carriers on each aircraft carrier and up to 2 or 3 nuclear warheads on each aircraft, it is easy to calculate how significant the degree of military strength this represents in the aggregate: approximately 1,800 nuclear warheads. And, if desired, the whole of this armada could be moved up to the European continent from other regions.

Therefore at a certain stage of the negotiations the Soviet side is within its rights to raise the issue not only of 6, but of all 15 American aircraft carriers.

During the Geneva meeting of ministers the American side was warned that if the United States continues to deploy its intermediate-range nuclear weapons in Europe, then this will simply lead to complication of the situation. Such actions on the part of the United States could call the forthcoming talks in question and would, of course, run counter to the aims of freezing all nuclear weapons, of which the Soviet side is in favor and which is finding growing understanding and support throughout the world, including in the United States itself.

Of every great significance is the common opinion expressed by the USSR and the United States as a result of the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva in January this year that the forthcoming talks, and efforts in the sphere of limiting and reducing weapons in general, must lead to the liquidation of nuclear weapons everywhere and in their entirety. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, since the time when nuclear weapons first appeared it has based its policy in matters of disarmament on the task of banning these weapons and using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only. As early as the middle of 1946 the USSR advanced a draft international convention within the framework of the United Nations on the banning of the production and use of weapons based on nuclear energy for the purposes of mass destruction. The draft envisaged banning the production and stockpiling of such weapons and liquidating already accumulated stocks. At the same time the Soviet side introduced a proposal for working out conditions of control over the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only and over observance of the conditions of the convention. Only because of opposition on the part of the Western powers, primarily the United States, did this and subsequent Soviet initiatives in this sphere fail to be realized.

The problem of liquidating nuclear weapons now, when vast arsenals have been amassed, is particularly serious. It is, in the full sense of the word, the problem of problems of contemporary international life. People's reason and conscience rise up against nuclear death continuing to threaten earth. There is no doubt that eliminating the nuclear danger would lead to a radical improvement in the world situation, strengthen trust between states, and provide an incentive for extensive and mutually advantageous cooperation between peoples.

The fact that the task of liquidating nuclear weapons is recorded in the joint Soviet-American document has, without a doubt, serious symbolic significance. And one must ensure that practical steps are taken which will lead to the fulfillment of this aim--precisely to the aim and not away from the solution to this problem, that is, the problem of halting the arms race, really reducing military arsenals, and, as a result, completely liquidating nuclear weapons.

The peoples expect agreements in precisely this direction from the forthcoming Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space weapons.

It must be said that at present in the United States and, as a service to Washington, also in some other Western countries statements continue to be made, the aim of which is to justify American plans for militarizing outer space which, if they are carried out, would inevitably lead to new intensification of the arms race, a dangerous undermining of strategic stability, and an increase in the threat of war. The matter is not only limited to publications in the mass information media. Official representatives of the administration, including the president, make statements that Washington does not intend to renounce its programs for the militarization of outer space.

It is superfluous to say that statements such as these, of course, are not conducive to creating a favorable atmosphere for constructively resolving problems at the forthcoming talks. They attest to the fact that the forces in the United States gambling on continuing to build up military arsenals and on using methods of pressure in politics have by no means given up the struggle. The influence of the American military-industrial complex, which regards outer space as a vast sphere for introducing the latest and increasingly complex and expensive weapons systems, is strongly felt behind all this.

A kind of symbol of the present administration's efforts aimed at militarizing outer space is, as is well-known, Washington's declared "strategic defense initiative"--precisely thus it is accepted in the United States to call the aforementioned plan to develop and build a large-scale anti-missile defense system with space-based elements. With the aid of this system it proposed, as its advocates claim, to protect the whole of U.S. territory from the strategic ballistic missiles of the "enemy," using strike means based in space for this purpose, which are based on new principles of physics--lasers, particle beam weapons, and so forth.

Attempts are made to prove that all these plans are supposedly called upon to improve the situation, stabilize the military balance, and create conditions for liquidating nuclear weapons and thereby for removing the threat of war. In confirmation of appraisals such as these, dozens of cunning arguments are put forward with the sole aim of confusing ill-informed people and justifying militarist programs.

The real aim of the comprehensive antimissile defense system thought up in the United States and the efforts to militarize outer space that are connected with it is totally different. It is planned as a means of gaining military

superiority for Washington and placing it in positions of dominance in the world arena. The comprehensive antimissile "shield" bears no relation to the needs of real defense. They wish to use it to protect themselves from a counterstrike so as to be able to more freely wield the "sword" of offensive nuclear weapons, including for the purposes of political blackmail and threats. The fact that it is precisely a question of such calculations is attested to by the prominent American researcher Thomas Keras [name as transliterated], who points out that the conviction that, supposedly, "the United States can use outer space in order to gain a vital—if not decisive—military advantage over the Soviet Union" is now widespread in the American military-space establishment. Basically, a large-scale antimissile defense system is regarded as an inalienable component part of offensive strategic potential intended to ensure the impunity of a first nuclear strike.

And no pseudo-theoretical exercises in the spirit of the doctrine of "deterrence through intimidation" can refute this fact. The increased pace at which programs are being implemented in the United States for further building up strategic offensive forces across the whole spectrum—both in the sphere of ICBMs, sea-launched ballistic missiles, heavy bombers, long-range cruise missiles, and in the sphere of Pershing II intermediate-range ballistic missiles—is clear, practical confirmation of the fact that the American "strategic defense initiative" is by no means aimed at strengthening defense, but at acquiring the potential for a first strike while counting on impunity. And the large-scale antimissile defense system itself, which is called upon to ensure impunity for the initiator of aggression, is increasingly merging with means of attack by virtue of the principle of operation of the means included in it: According to reports in the American press, it is also proposed to use space-based antimissile defense means for attacking satellites, aircraft, and other "enemy" targets.

One wonders whether this kind of "initiative" can lead to greater stability and help to resolve arms limitation problems? Of course not. Connected with the aspiration to gain military superiority, it faces the other side with the necessity to adopt measures to protect its own security. A new and far more dangerous and expensive spiral of the arms race will be the inevitable consequence of this. Mankind will climb even higher up the ladder of nuclear confrontation. Instead of a step being taken in the direction of liquidating nuclear weapons, there will be a further build-up of these weapons in the conditions of the general increase in mistrust between states and the intensified danger of war. The heads of the Stockholm International Institute for Peace Research, B. Dzhasani and K. Li [names as transliterated], arrive at the simple conclusion: "The possible use of weapons based on the use of high-energy beams as a means of antimissile defense could have a destabilizing influence on the mutual relations between the two superpowers ... by no means rendering nuclear weapons obsolete, in actual fact lasers are capable of intensifying the arms race."

And the matter does not change depending on whether it is a question of deploying a three-tier large-scale antimissile defense system with space-based elements or at first only a two-tier system—introducing strike weapons into

outer space would seriously destabilize the situation and place it on the brink of crisis. The prominent American physician and Nobel Prize laureate Hans Bethe gives the circumspect and sensible advice: "If it is truly our aim to reduce the danger emanating from nuclear weapons for our people, we should avoid adhering to the idea of global antimissile defense, because this would lead to the totally opposite result: A massive build-up in nuclear weapons aimed at us, with the simultaneous of an incredibly complex defense system the effectiveness of which would remain a total secret right up to the tragic moment when it would be put in operation. It is difficult to imagine a more unstable and dangerous situation."

Washington claims that switching over to building a large-scale antimissile defense system will open up some kind of new era in the business of arms limitation and will "revolutionize" the entire approach to fulfilling the task of reducing the danger of war. In actual fact, it is not a question of "revolution," but a "counterrevolution" in this matter. By standing up for a large-scale antimissile defense system they are attacking the effective unlimited Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and trying to cast doubt on one of the most important principles of the struggle for disarmament--the principle of limiting antimissile defense system, which was the basis for the conclusion of the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and then also the SALT II Treaty. Instead of this, it is now proposed to follow a different path--that of the unlimited deployment of antimissile defense system in conjunction (and this is constantly emphasized) with a powerful arsenal of traditional strategic offensive weapons.

Thus, the entire "revolution" amounts to "substantiating" under cover of pseudo-peaceloving phraselogy, an ultimate rejection of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and of the course once chosen and tested by the sides of limiting and reducing strategic weapons as a means of strengthening stability and peace. They now intend to fulfill these aims--including the task of liquidating nuclear weapons--by means of the arms race, and primarily space arms. This approach is nothing but absurd.

In an obvious attempt to appease public opinion, alarmed at the Pentagon's preparations in the sphere of large-scale antimissiles defense, representatives of the American Administration claim that nothing reprehensible is going on here and that everything, quote, amounts to scientific research work--there is as yet no question of deploying space weapons.

Arguments such as these cannot delude anyone. The so-called "research" work is a most important element in the process of creating any type of weapon. As experience has shown, the distance between "research" and deployment can be very short. Even nuclear weapons appeared as a result of "research work" within the framework of the "Manhattan Project."

While flinging vast resources into "research" in the sphere of space weapons, Washington hopes to adapt the latest achievements of scientific-technical thinking to military needs. And since it is a question of programs calculated for a very long period, "research" begun now is regarded as a kind of guarantee that the present militarist course in policy will be consolidated for decades ahead. With the aid of multibillion dollar "research" work, they are trying to deprive America's future leaders of the freedom of political choice. The calculation is simple: surely it will be impossible to reject something on which colossal means have already been expended? And it is by no means simply a question of "research" in the United States. A recently published article by the head of the American delegation at the Geneva talks. Kampelman, written in conjunction with Z. Brzezinski and Professor of Physics R. Jastrow, contains an unambiguous appeal for the immediate--by the beginning of the nineties--deployment of antimissile weapons in space. Even the basic parameters of the outer space wing of antimissile defense are cited--100 artificial satellites would be incorporated in this defense with 15,000 interceptor missiles deployed on them, plus satellites and stations for reconnaissance, communications, and control. The total cost--\$43 billion. This, we repeat, is not a plan for "research" work, but a plan for deployment. As one can see, the borderlines in this sphere are conditional and very fine.

The label "research work," with which they try to disguise the destabilizing nature of programs at present being implemented in the United States in the building of space weapons, cannot alter the essence of the picture. And the essence amounts to the fact that, by virtue of their very aim--to build a ramified anti-missile defense system--these programs run counter to the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, which prohibits the anti-missile defense of a country's territory and does not permit the building, testing, and deployment of space-based anti-missile defense systems or components. Washington is also not troubled by the fact that the limitations established in the treaty on the building of such systems on new physical principles are thereby being violated.

It is totally clear that a continuation of U.S. "research" work in the sphere of space weapons would lead to an overturning of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the destruction of the entire process of limiting and reducing weapons. In this connection, it would be useful if those in Washington who now advocate developing the "Strategic Defense Initiative" were to recall those appraisals of the ABM Treaty given by American leaders at the time of its ratification. Speaking at a hearing of the Senate Committee for Foreign Affairs on 19 June 1972, U.S. Secretary of State W. Rogers emphasized that the ABM Treaty and the Interim Agreement "are not only important for the American people--they are important for all peoples. Their importance not only lies in the achievements they contain, but also in their potentials. The limitation of strategic weapons is not a unique effort, but a constant process. The aforementioned agreements are an important achievement." In the course of the same hearing Secretary of Defense H. Laird noted: "The ABM Treaty and the Interim Agreement on offensive weapons, which are at present under examination by Congress, are in American interests and the in interests of peace as a whole. They strengthen our security." A similar conclusion was reached by the chairman

of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral T. Moorer: "The ABM Treaty and the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms ... are constructed in such a way as to serve a common aim—the preservation of peace."

Is this not in striking contrast to the statements by the present U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger, who has repeatedly and publicly spoken in favor of revising or even renouncing the ABM Treaty for the sake of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," which has by rights been christened as the plan for the preparation of "star wars?"

It is becoming increasingly obvious--connecting outer space with programs of military preparations would inevitably lead to a sharp increase in the danger of a nuclear war breaking out. A fatal mistake would be made for the consequences of which present and future generations would have to pay dearly.

And one more thing. While continuing to pursue a policy of further increasing military appropriations and building up its nuclear arsenal, in recent years Washington has adopted the rule of presenting all kinds of "reports" and "research" on the subject of "violations" supposedly committed by the Soviet Union with regard to its obligations in arms limitation issues. The most recent example of this is the "report" sent by the administration to the U.S. Congress at the beginning of February of this year.

Even a superficial acquaintance with this opus is sufficient to understand that it is crammed with fabrications which are enough to set one's teeth on edge, and with just one aim--to try in one way or another to cast a shadow on the consistent peace-loving policy of the USSR and on the great prestige of the Soviet side as a partner in negotiations and international agreements. With the aid of unsubstantiated "claims," the authors of the "report" strive to present the issue in such a way as to make it appear that it is supposedly not the United States but the Soviet Union that is wrecking the process of arms limitation and impeding the adoption of effective measures in this sphere.

They would shamelessly like to lay the blame on someone else--on the off chance that someone will swallow the propagandist concoction. We will cite just one example of the arguments to which the compilers of the "report" resort. It is perfectly well-known that it is precisely Washington that has officially adopted a course to build a large-scale anti-missile defense system with space-based elements, although, as has already been said, such systems [word indistinct] and unequivocally prohibited by the unlimited Soviet-American treaty of 1972. Despite this obvious fact of the United States' openly scornful attitude towards the agreement in effect, the administration considers it possible to strike the pose of guardian of the ABM Treaty and states that there are supposedly "signs" that ... the Soviet Union is preparing to deploy a large-scale anti-missile defense system.

Here we have a blatant forgery. None other than the USSR has repeatedly proposed and continues to propose that the United States solemnly renounce the very idea of building ramified anti-missile defense systems with space-based elements

and thereby confirm its adherence to the 1972 treaty. Precisely the Soviet side, including within the framework of the United Nations, has persistently striven for decisions that would place a barrier in the way of the arms race spreading to outer space and ensure that it is used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

But obviously truth in politics is not held in esteem by some figures in Washington. There they prefer to disguise their destructive course in arms limitation matters by fabrications and slander against the policy of the other side. At least, it is a strange way of preparing for the forthcoming talks.

It goes without saying that the talks which are to begin in Geneva will not be simple. Such are the specifics of the mutually connected problems included on the agenda.

It would be wrong—but, unfortunately, some American representatives do precisely this—to put the public in a pessimistic frame of mind in advance, even before the delegations have begun the discussions, and to predict a long and basically fruitless outlook for the talks. We will talk, they say, but the arms race will continue to take its course all the same.

The arguments put forward in Washington regarding the possibilities of reaching agreement, which match this deliberate scepticism, only speak of the versions which would give the United States unilateral advantages. In this respect individual problems relating to nuclear weapons are declared suitable for resolving, while problems relating to outer space are to be shelved for an unspecified period of time. And meanwhile it is envisaged that the pace at which programs for building space-based strike weapons are implemented will be stepped up.

Attempts to cut the natural mutual link between the problems which are to be discussed at the talks can only fail. Agreement in the sphere under consideration is possible only on the basis of strictly observing the principle of parity and equal security.

As far as complications are concerned, then they are inevitable in such a major issue, but also surmountable. All that is required for this is an honest approach, good will, readiness for reasonable compromises, and the wish on both sides to resolve the problem in the interests of peace and security.

The creation of a favorable atmosphere for productive work at the talks would also have very great significance. From this point of view it is inadmissible for steps to be taken which run counter to the task of preventing an arms race in outer space and halting the arms race on earth. It goes without saying that the talks would be helped if the United States were to follow the example of the Soviet Union and reject the first use of nuclear weapons, and if there were to be a freeze on nuclear arsenals and a complete and general ban on the testing of nuclear weapons. The USSR has persistently put forward these proposals for a long time.

The peoples and governments of the majority of countries are decisively in favor of improving the international situation, halting the arms race, safeguarding the peace of outer space, and removing nuclear weapons from the face of the earth. This was loudly and clearly stated, for example, in the Declaration adopted on 28 January this year at a conference in Delhi of the heads of state and government of six countries--India, Mexico, Sweden, Tanzania, Argentina, and Greece.

The agreement reached between the USSR and the United States on the talks which are to begin on 12 March creates the conditions for seriously and fruitfully examining the corresponding problems. It contains the only scheme possible under the present conditions for resolving the problem of nuclear and space weapons. It is a question of adhering to this agreement and strictly complying with it in practice in all sections.

The position to which the Soviet Union will adhere at the forthcoming talks was concisely expressed by K. U. Chernenko in his replies to the questions put by the correspondent for the American CNN Television Company, S. Loory: "A positive outcome of the new Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons would have a salutary effect on the situation in the world and would be a major step along the path of resolving cardinal problems of the contemporary era.

"The Soviet Union will work in this direction and strive for weighty and concrete results in Geneva."

The USSR has a right to expect the same approach from the American side.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", "Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn'", 1985.

CSO: 5200/1038

SPACE ARMS

CHERNYSHEV NOTES SDI PREPARATION CONSEQUENCES

LD151827 Moscow TASS in English 1814 GMT 15 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS--TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

At the started Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, the USSR is ready to look for and to work out most radical solutions which would make it possible to move toward full prohibition and, ultimately, elimination of nuclear weapons. The Soviet leadership have repeatedly emphasised that in the present-day conditions it is of importance to prevent the transfer of the arms race to outer space. If this is done, it is unreal to hope for reduction and limitation of nuclear arms.

However, the U.S. administration is obviously unwilling to abandon its "strategic defence initiative" which envisages the creation of an anti-missile defence network with space-based elements.

Washington, shamelessly manipulating far-fetched "reasons" and ruthlessly exploiting peaceable phraseology, is trying to convince the public that the "initiative" will ostensibly ensure defence against a massive nuclear strike, will make it possible to achieve a new strategic stability, and will render nuclear weapons "obsolete."

What would be the consequences of preparation for "star wars" in actual fact? Firstly, the realisation of the "initiative" would mean an undermining of the arms limitation and reduction process, would nullify everything positive that was achieved in the seventies and would undermine the Soviet-U.S. treaty of unlimited duration on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems--the most important agreement on arms control.

Secondly, the security of the United States would not grow in any way but would only decrease. Most U.S. experts agree that no anti-missile defence system can ensure a close-to-hundred-percent defence against strategic ballistic missiles and render totally ineffective other delivery vehicles--bombers and cruise missiles.

Thirdly, the "initiative" would become a new stimulus to the acceleration and expansion of the arms race. It is extremely absurd to suppose that the prospect of deployment by the United States of systems which can undermine the effectiveness of Soviet missile forces would not encounter resolute

counteractions. This, incidentally, is understood quite well in the Pentagon. According to a statement by Richard Delauer, U.S. undersecretary of defence, a defence system can be neutralised in any conditions, should an enemy only want very much to do so. Historical experience shows, too, that new defence concepts only made experts work on the creation of more effective offensive systems. Thus, the realisation of the "star wars" concept would entail an increase in nuclear arsenals, the introduction of systems to overcome anti-missile defence systems and expansion of anti-missile defence systems themselves, i.e. an endless chain of dangerous steps under an "action-counteraction" scheme.

Fourthly, it is seen already now that the "initiative" is a recipe for unlimited rivalry from the viewpoint of colossal military expenditures. The "first payment" alone would amount for the United States to 26,000-30,000 million dollars in the coming five years, which will be used for research, experimental and design work. By way of comparison, it can be pointed out that, in the prices of the 1986 financial year, 15,000 million dollars were spent on the "Manhattan Project" under which an atomic bomb was created, and 40,000 million dollars were spent for the entire research in the field of military missile technology over thirty years (from 1954 to 1983). The deployment of a large-scale anti-missile defense network will cost the U.S. taxpayers 1,000,000 million dollars or even more.

Fifthly, the deployment of the anti-missile defence system would lead to an increase in the danger of a deliberate unleashing of a nuclear war. President Reagan admitted in March 1983 that any defence system if combined with offensive systems can be regarded as a factor contributing to an aggressive policy. At the same time Washington, while insisting on continuation of the work in the field of anti-missile defence systems, continues to actively produce offensive nuclear weapons and is trying in every way to emphasise that the "star wars" programme in no way lessens the need for six new offensive systems which are first-nuclear-strike ones.

It is perfectly clear that the intention to get an opportunity to destroy by means of anti-missile defence systems the strategic systems of the other side, i.e. stripping it of a capability of delivering a retaliatory strike, cannot be regarded otherwise than a calculation to disarm the Soviet Union in the face of the U.S. nuclear threat.

Sixthly, the creation of anti-missile defence systems would incomparably enhance the danger of an unsanctioned, accidental outbreak of a nuclear war. A possibility of a system's false actuation is an unsurmountable systemic drawback of any automated system. Even in the U.S. present less-sophisticated air defence systems, more than 150 false alarms envisaging the use of nuclear weapons were registered by the middle of 1983. A large-scale anti-missile defence system, according to U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger, is contemplated to pinpoint missiles within some fractions of a second, to differentiate real targets from false ones, to aim and to actuate various types of weapons for the destruction of targets. How great for it will be probability of an error which would be fatal to the whole world?

Everything that has been mentioned confirms once again that it is now impossible to tackle the problem of strengthening security and reducing nuclear arms in isolation from preventing militarisation of outer space.

SPACE ARMS

FRENCH DEFENSE OFFICIALS URGE MILITARY SPACE CAPABILITY

PM181929 Paris LE MONDE in French 16 Mar 85 p 4

[Article by senior Defense Ministry officials under pseudonym "Critias":
"Toward a European Military Space Capability"]

[Text] "My aim is to render nuclear weapons obsolete in order to be able to eliminate them," President Reagan proudly stated in December 1984.

Will he achieve his ends? Nobody knows. The Americans will not be able to equip themselves with an antinuclear shield in less than 40 years. The credibility of this shield is already being questioned by many scientists and strategic experts, especially in the United States. Is there any need to recall that for the time being it only amounts to a 5-year research program costing \$25 billion?

The U.S. President's remarks are already having a negative psychological effect. Some people are casting doubt on the concept of deterrence which has guaranteed peace in Europe since 1945, creating a deadlock on security in the intervening period. It is strange, to say the least, to see Ronald Reagan join the disparate camp of those who condemn the use of nuclear weapons to safeguard peace.

Of course appearances may be favorable to simple ideas like "it is better to defend yourself than to attack" or "nuclear weapons are too devastating not to try and eliminate them." But reality sometimes has little to do with appearances. It is precisely because a war between nuclear states could not be limited that there have never been any direct conflicts between them.

Allergy

Of course it is easy to understand that the U.S. President wants to reassure those who suspect him of being too eager to seek confrontation with the Soviets. However, it is very unfortunate that he should do it in this way. Indeed it will become more difficult for the Americans to bemoan the "nuclear allergy" of some European allies, not to mention the New Zealanders or Australians. When he condemns the immorality of nuclear weapons Mr Reagan is talking in terms which the pacifists would not repudiate. He is indirectly running the risk of increasing their influence and determination.

Yet he is the same President who campaigned for a nuclear arms program to which he has decided to devote more than \$50 billion for the next 5 years. In addition, he has told Congress that a negative vote on the MX missile (known as 'peacekeeper') would indicate to the Soviets that the United States does not have "the necessary determination to maintain a viable strategic triad and the deterrence policy it represents."

Deterrence has been the foundation of European security for 40 years. It will have to keep this role for at least the same length of time. So it is wise to try and remove its credibility? And with what will it be replaced?

New Stage

Nonetheless these American plans have one merit: that of highlighting the growing importance of space in strategic affairs. The Europeans cannot leave the way clear for the superpowers alone nor respond separately. Why then not decide on a European space capability, in the military sphere among others? This capability could, among other things, make it possible to monitor adherence to disarmament agreements. Why not accept scientific cooperation since we are being asked to do so? But we should do so after listing European needs to avoid exhausting ourselves in a technological forced march, with the pace dictated to us.

While the difference in status with regard to nuclear weapons makes strategic cooperation among European countries difficult, the virtual equality which now exists with regard to space should facilitate a joint effort. This is a new stage in the building of Europe. Will the Europeans succeed in overcoming their divisions in a down-to-earth way?

CSO: 5200/2524

SPACE ARMS

FRENCH GENERAL URGES REALISM ON 'STAR WARS' REPERCUSSION

PM301533 Paris LE MONDE in French 29 Jan 85 p 2

[Article by General Fricaud-Chagnaud, chairman of the National Defense Studies Foundation: "The Pretenses of 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] At a time when sources of entertainment are few and far between, it is amusing to see the extent to which the science-fiction overtones produced by turning President Reagan's daunting "Strategic Defense Initiative" into star wars is enough to make commentators who claim to be very experienced lose all sense of time and proportion.

Indeed it has become almost commonplace to state that star wars will render the French and British deterrent forces obsolete in the near future. It is frequently possible to see, behind the feigned commiseration, the as yet unavowed hope of a return to the good old days of Russian-American condominium.

However, the situation deserves a closer look. President Reagan has in fact proposed a 5-year research and feasibility study, but, after that, several major decisions will still have to be taken. It will first be necessary to successfully carry out the necessary tests, then to move on to the production of prototypes, and, finally to the mass production, and deployment, of a whole system.

Indeed it is not a matter of having two or three virtually experimental nuclear weapons, as in 1945, or of sending two men to the moon, where they had no adversary to face, as in 1969. Instead it will be necessary to have a very large number of weapons ready to function immediately, without defects, and controlled by a hyper-efficient system which, to be meaningful, ought to be almost 100-percent efficient.

To understand more clearly what this means, let us recall that people have long known how to kill a man with a bullet from a gun and, yet, there are still combatants on the battlefields, even after the invention of the machine gun.

People also know, or ought to know, the time it takes to produce a new weapon system in spheres which do not involve technological breakthroughs of the same

order as the ones envisaged in this case. For instance, the new Franco-German helicopter will not go into production until 1992; the future European fighter plane on which serious work is being carried out, is scheduled for 1998; similarly, in the United States, the successor to the F-16 and F-18 aircraft is only scheduled for 1996.

With regard to star wars, by simplifying things in a way which some people will regard as excessive, it is certainly possible to brush aside:

- Purely technical obstacles, although many American scientists regard the project as unrealistic. In this connection it is important not to forget the rules for calculating probabilities which are applied to a multitier system;

- The possibility of countermeasures, saturation, or circumvention--for instance, with supersonic cruise missiles;

- Administrative and financial problems, given that the American budget has to be approved every year by legislatures which are not inclined to bow to the White House's will on this matter, and that it is more than likely that, in the period of time required, there will have been several changes of government party;

- The diplomatic problems linked to arms control, honoring the ABM treaty, or, more simply, the requirements of East-West dialogue, necessarily involving some bargaining.

Nonetheless, if, for strictly technical reasons, the proposed American shield cannot be installed at best before the second decade of the next century, it is more than likely that the Soviet system could only be deployed after some delay, and this, moreover, is the reason for their strong reactions. The latter's defense systems, however, are the only ones which concern us, and which must be taken into account in assessing our forces' potential.

In addition, it is ridiculous to compare--the more readily to condemn them--the performances of our weapons in 1990 with the possible capabilities of systems which could not be fully operational before 2010. Our weapon systems have time to develop between now and then too. Furthermore, we must not lose sight of the fact that their mission is strictly one of deterrence. Our weapons, therefore, do not need the accuracy and performance vital to a counterforce strategy. In this connection it does not much matter to us that a first strike might be rendered ineffective some time in the future. If, at the same time, just 10 percent of our warheads are still capable of reaching their targets, our minimum assured deterrence of the strong by the weak will still remain valid.

In any case, therefore, the French and British deterrent forces still have many more years ahead of them than they have behind them. Moreover, this does not mean that we regard deterrence as immutable and inviolable. Quite the reverse: It is a constantly changing sphere in which the greatest vigilance must be maintained in all sectors--technical, political, and human.

Whatever the psychological impact of the Reagan plan, whatever its problems, and its hitches, we can already be sure that it will have considerable repercussions, be it on the balance of forces, East-West relations, or, on the other hand, relations among the allies.

But, above all, the technological repercussions of such an investment are bound to be far reaching and diverse, and likely to affect almost all industrial spheres. A new scientific competition has just begun which, whether we like it or not, is bound to produce a resurgence of industrial competition, and a new arms race.

It is appropriate, therefore, to take care, because 30 years is not much in the life of a country, and we must be ready to make the necessary efforts, possibly alone, or, better still, in the framework of increased European solidarity. But let us at least do so as aware and forewarned adults, able to keep a sense of proportion about what is undoubtedly a forewarning, and not as children for whom the future has no more weight than the past.

CSO: 5200/2520

SPACE ARMS

PCI DEPUTY SAYS SDI INCREASES POSSIBILITY OF WAR

PM221005 Rome L'UNITA in Italian 16 Mar 85 p 4

[Article by PCI Deputy Luciana Castellina: "A return to the 'Possibility' of War"]

[Text] Francesco Alogero was certainly right when he wrote in last Sunday's L'UNITA that Reagan's space defense plan (Strategic Defense Initiative) [SDI] is technically impossible. As is known, the same view was expressed by the independent American scientific community (in other words not paid by the arms industry) when the new idea was first announced about 2 years ago. And yet, there is nothing consoling in the observation. However, this is not only because continuing research on a possible space defense system would lead to a further escalation in the arms race, or because the plan does have a feasible aspect which consists of defending the sites housing the American strategic missiles — thus annulling the only positive arms control agreement ever reached, the 1972 ABM agreement.

The SDI's objective is in fact different and likely to have wider repercussions. It is more "political" than technical. It consists of perfecting the new so-called "war-fighting" theories, which have for some time replaced mutual assured destruction [MAD], in other words deterrence. As relative nuclear parity was established between the USSR and the United States, MAD in fact had one important weakness: it demonstrated that nuclear war was madness. It showed that only a madman would dare to launch the first strike, knowing that the inevitable retaliation would expose his own country to destruction.

So, this being the case, what was the point of having so many nuclear weapons if you knew it was impossible to use them again at the "official" enemy, and if threatening to use them to discourage a particular political or economic change contrary to your own interests in a particular part of the world (which is the main and immediate operational function of nuclear power) looked increasingly like a bluff? In short: To restore a role to the bomb it seemed increasingly necessary to show that it could really and rationally be used. To achieve this MAD had to be buried, and war had to be restored to the place which Von Clausewitz had given it: among political actions.

A precondition for demonstrating that a war can be rational even in the nuclear age is naturally to show that it is possible to reduce the quantity of enemy casualties to an "acceptable minimum" (a criterion which is obviously only relatively comforting to those included in the minimum, but nevertheless more convincing than the prospect of a general holocaust). It is precisely these conditions which military science seems to have achieved in recent years, by operating at two separate levels: 1)

the offensive level, intended to put the bulk of the enemy's potential out of action in the first strike (a condition effectively achieved by the intermediate-range missiles through their rapidity and accuracy in hitting the targets, and because of the difficulty of intercepting them in flight); 2 -- the defensive level (which was given absolute priority in the U.S. Administration's latest military spending programs), which gave rise to the planning and creation of extra-atmospheric systems, based on the proposed lasers, and particle beam weapons; to C3, new and fairly satisfactory control, command, and communication systems used to counterbalance the effects of the explosions, radiation, and electromagnetic pulses; and finally, to the famous SDI, the AEM shield, which is certainly inadequate to withstand the onslaught of a massive first strike, but is capable -- as Giuseppe Nardulli rightly wrote, also in last Sunday's L'UNITA -- of reducing "to an acceptable minimum" the losses produced, however much residual capacity for enemy reprisals could come from the few missiles which had survived the first attack.

Now, if these new offensive and defensive systems are combined with the air-land battle, the doctrine already made operational for the American forces wherever they might be (thus in Europe too) and which consists of tactics of penetrating behind the enemy lines for up to 1,000 km, with a mixture of conventional, chemical, electronic, and nuclear weapons, we have the most modern representation of the old "Blitzkrieg" theory, the famous lightning war which was Hitler's most effective invention, although he used fairly rudimentary resources.

To appreciate the significance of the SDI; to avoid being misled by its name ("defense"); or being induced to underestimate its scope because of its lack of credibility as a real invulnerable shield, it is therefore necessary to place the Reagan plan in the more complex framework of the new military technology and theories of which it is an integral part; and, above all, in the context of the ideological change the President has made in U.S. foreign policy. This is why I said that the SDI's function is political: It serves as a logical support to the theories that war is once again within the realms of possibility -- that it can be fought and even won. Moreover it must be, because not just Soviet superiority but even parity is unacceptable.

It is important that anybody fighting for peace should take full note of these changes in more recent military doctrine and practice: because running the risk of even "just" a "minimum" of destruction, given the foreseeable scale of that "minimum," is certainly unacceptable to any reasonable person (especially because nobody is really in a position to assess the possible consequences in the long term); and yet it is true that, although aberrant, the new theories have restored a degree of "rationality" to nuclear war. However, it is no longer enough to oppose it by referring to the possibility of a general holocaust, but these specific doctrines must be combated on a more individual basis for what they are, condemning those responsible for them from time to time. This must be done by starting to give the SDI its full weight, especially in the Geneva negotiations, where it is by no means irrelevant.

CSO: 5200/2533

SPACE ARMS

L'UNITA WARNS OF 'DANGEROUS CONFUSION' ON SDI

PM260908 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 19 Mar 85 p 4

[Carlo Bernardini article: "Operation To Dispel Suspicions"]

[text] It is undeniable that a number of proposals, opinions, and watchwords on matters of peace and war have recently gained currency among the public -- for instance, "strategic defense," "the benefits of military research," and other (minor) ones. This has happened easily, as is always the case with cliches which people believe they can understand immediately by looking no further than their literal meaning. It is interesting, for instance, to note the persistent attempt in recent weeks to alter the threatening name "star wars" into the apparently more technical definition "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) favored by Reagan. The operation has the evident intention of dispelling both suspicions of aggressiveness and those of the military utilization of space, and of bringing the magic word "defense" to the forefront. But such issues must be analyzed and understood at a level well beyond mere words and must be assessed in all their immediate and far-reaching implications. I would like to try to contribute to this analysis, together with the others who have already done so in L'UNITA.

It is very likely that the U.S. system has an extra asset that the Soviet system lacks -- the asset of technological sophistication. It seems politically plausible, given the Reagan mentality, to exploit this asset to the utmost to revive the old concept of military "superiority."

However, the U.S. President is not so stupid as to set his sights on a superiority in his capacity to destroy his adversary, which has not made sense for over 20 years. So he plays the invulnerability card and launches the "Strategic Defense Initiative" program (23 March 1983). A group of four authoritative U.S. commentators -- Bundy, Kennan, McNamara, and Smith -- have written in this regard: "We believe that the President's initiative is a classic case of good intentions that will have bad results because they are not realistic." They added: "What is basically wrong with the President's objective is that it cannot be attained..." but Francesco Calogero has already discussed this fully in L'UNITA on 10 March.

Apart from the technological difficulties of the project it seems to me that one should stress that the Soviets -- as they have already cautiously hinted -- have a simple and inexpensive response (compared to an extremely costly high-technology defense program), which consists of building enough ICBM's to saturate the defense system. Such a response would seem unpopular because it would resort to the destruction of the adversary instead of to defense. But it becomes less unpopular when one learns while the U.S. strategic initiative is aimed at defense against Soviet ICBM's alone, the

United States will maintain its aggressive apparatus to retaliate against attacks with bombers and cruise missiles. The initiative therefore opens the way to a disconcerting imbalance between the two blocs that will make any negotiations increasingly difficult. Even now the 1972 ABM treaty is in jeopardy.

Nevertheless, it could be that the United States will decide to confine itself to activities of pure technological research that would not violate the ABM treaty. It is claimed that such research would in any case be a good thing because, despite its military origin, it would bring benefits to the civilian sector. Our prime minister seems to share this opinion, judging from his statements to the lower house, the newspapers, and the U.S. Congress. But such an opinion, without a careful analysis of the implications, is worth as much as the slogan "research is beautiful." There are many doubts about the social desirability of research directed from a military viewpoint, but the major uncertainty concerns the capacity to assess real needs possessed by a country whose government talks about research in such a way. This is not enough -- because we will have to beware of the "industrial consensus" that could be nurtured, with the lure of profitable orders, by this political approach to questions of research.

In view of these few observations, which are among the simplest that can be made, I can only stress that once again we are witnessing a dangerous confusion and that the public must be provided with assessments that are not open to distortion through the evocative power of words. So the Strategic Defense Initiative must be viewed with open eyes, together with all that remains concealed behind it, from the danger of the obligatory Soviet response to the militarization of a growing number of production sectors. Thus too the particular sense of the word "research" that stems from cooperation on military programs must not be confused in the least with its more usual sense in the developed countries -- if for no other reason than because the results of research, in its usual meaning, are an asset available to all, which is something certainly denied to research for military purposes, of which secrecy is an integral part. So anyone who says that the path of space defense and of research into it is that of security and benefits is talking irresponsibly and taking risks at our expense.

CSO: 5200/2533

SPACE ARMS

VAN DEN BROEK CAUTIONS PARLIAMENT ON SDI

The Hague ANP NEWS BULLETIN in English 7 Mar 85 pp 1-2

[Text] The Hague, March 7--Holland must be careful not to reject out of hand the United States' strategic defence initiative (SDI)—also known as "star wars"—and so isolate itself internationally, Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek warned here last night.

Addressing the second chamber during a debate on his ministry's 1985 budget, Van den Broek said he opposed the opposition's call for Holland to support moves for a treaty banning the development and deployment of weapons in space.

The minister said Dutch rejection would serve only to isolate the country while space research continued. The chance to monitor such development critically would then be lost, he said.

Van den Broek said he favoured instead an active Dutch role in discussions concerning technique and strategy.

"What we are talking about here is a switch from offensive, nuclear systems to defensive, non-nuclear weapons systems," the minister noted, adding that no one could now accurately estimate the possible advantages or drawbacks of the American programme.

But he agreed with a second chamber majority that some purpose would be served by concerted action in the framework of European political cooperation (EPS).

East-West Relations

The foreign minister said there were signals of improved East-West relations, but he rejected the idea that Holland must find a mid-way position between the superpowers.

The conflict between the two super powers was one of "freedom versus lack of freedom" the minister said. This did not mean, however, that Holland would cease in its efforts to contribute to a gradual thaw in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In this context he drew attention to Dutch efforts to improve relations with East European countries and to reestablish contact with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko.

Van den Broek said he understood there were "organisational reasons" why contact established with Gromyko during the United Nations General Assembly in New York had not yet been renewed.

The foreign minister said he expected his opposite numbers from East Germany, Hungary and Czechoslovakia to call on him this year and noted that "the threat had been picked up again" with Poland.

Misplaced Defeatism

The Dutch government shared the second chamber's almost unanimous disappropriation of the Soviet Union's continued violent presence in Afghanistan, the minister said, adding there were no indications of a Soviet pull-out.

He regarded a motion calling for the withdrawal of Soviet forces as submitted by the Labour party the two government coalition parties—CDA and VVD—as an endorsement of government policy.

Van den Broek said he would pass on to Development Cooperation Minister Eegje Scholte the chamber's call for more emergency aid to be made available for Afghani refugees.

He cautioned the chamber against overoptimism about the outcome of U.S.-Soviet arms talks reopening next week, but also warned against misplaced defeatism which he perceived among Labour MPs.

CSO: 5200/2529

SPACE ARMS

GROMYKO CONCLUDES MADRID VISIT

Moran, Gromyko Luncheon Toasts

LD011628 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1500 GMT 1 Mar 85

[Text] This is the 2d day of the official visit to Spain by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko. This morning he was received by King Don Juan Carlos. Afterwards he had lunch with his Spanish counterpart. Juan Antonio Sacaluga reports:

During his toast at the lunch held at the Viana Palace, Minister Gromyko expressed his confidence that the Spanish Government would make a constructive contribution to the task of restraining the arms race and avoiding the militarization of space. Space can do it if it wishes, the Soviet minister said, after congratulating the Spanish executive on the decision to keep our country free of nuclear weapons. A few minutes before this, Minister Moran told the Soviet foreign minister that Spain's alignment with the West did not mean its subordination.

[Begin Moran recording] Spain, for obvious geographical, historical and cultural reasons, is part of the West and defends its values and ways of life. Starting from this reality it is our duty and our wish to look for and maintain a certain margin of autonomy. This is simply the defense of our national interest. A defense which does not want to alter the balance of powers: I believe it does not want to be subject to the subordination of any (?country). [end recording]

Without expressly mentioning U.S. President Reagan, Minister Gromyko said:

[Begin Gromyko recording in Russian fading into Spanish translation] Some public figures are apparently obsessed with drawing up plans for space militarization, saying that they guarantee arms reduction. [end recording]

Gromyko described this argument as scholastic and said that in order to achieve an agreement on the reduction of arsenals it is necessary to abandon the so-called "star wars" plan. Using the same indirect tone, Gromyko accused certain states of not respecting the sovereignty of Third World independent countries and expressed the need to end state terrorism.

Gromyko on Arms Race

PA011603 Madrid EFE in Spanish 1530 GMT 1 Mar 85

[Excerpts] Madrid, 1 Feb (EFE)--Spanish Foreign Minister Fernando Moran has emphasized the willingness of his government to have "a certain autonomy" in the defense of the West during the luncheon that he hosted for Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko today. The need to stop the arms race was highlighted in teh speeches by the Spanish foreign minister and his Soviet counterpart.

For his part, Gromyko emphasized that the Soviet-U.S. negotiations affect Western Europe in a special way and that Spain can help stop the arms race "fighting so that the level of nuclear confrontation will not increase in Europe." "In the USSR," he added, "we have appreciated the Spanish Government's decision to keep Spain a state free of nuclear weapons for its just value."

Gromyko stated that the interviews he has held in Madrid have centered on "how to prevent the militarization of space, curb the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and ward off a new war."

The Soviet minister affirmed that the possibility of a nuclear war "is not an exaggeration" if the arms race is allowed to "burst into space." He ridiculed the attempts of the U.S. authorities--without directly mentioning them--to convince the people that "the path toward disarmament must cross the path of manufacturing new types of weapons that become mroe sophisticated each day."

"The USSR's response," Gromyko said, "is the following: The plans to achieve military supremacy will not materialize on earth or in space." He added that "once we abandon the 'star wars' plan new possibilities for reaching an agreement on the reduction, even drastic reduction, of strategic weapons and medium-range nuclear weapons will open."

Moran News Conference on Visit

LD012137 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1908 GMT 1 Mar 85

[Press Conference on USSR Foreign Minister Gromyko's visit given by Fernando Moran, minister of foreign affairs, to series of unidentified reporters at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and reported by Madrid reporter Juan Antonio Sacaluga--live]

[Excerpt] [Journalist] How does Mr Gromyko view the new peace initiatives in the Middle East, Sr Moran?

[Moran] We also discussed this. We spoke in particular about the dialogue between 'Arafat and Husayn rather than peace initiatives. As you know, for some time the Soviet Union has proposed an international conference on the Near East. This is not, let's say, incompatible with these Jordanian-Palestinian initiatives, but the principal objective in the search for peace by the Soviet Union includes an international conference in the Near East.

This is part of the press conference--or rather the conversation--which Sr Moran is holding with journalists on the steps of the Santa Cruz Palace. Before handing you back to the studio, I should like to add that Sr Moran said that he was not thinking of making any pronouncement on behalf of the Spanish Government on the U.S. "star wars" plan and Mr Gromyko, in a very brief statement--even briefer than his statement yesterday--said, when asked about the subject of the Geneva disarmament talks, that he would not venture to make any forecasts, but that, in any event, the results of these negotiations do not depend just on the Soviet Union, but also on the United States. He also said that he is not thinking of making any further statements.

That is all for now from the Santa Cruz Palace.

Moran, Gromyko on 'Star Wars'

LD012251 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 2000 GMT 1 Mar 85

[Text] The meeting between the Spanish and Soviet delegations led by Fernando Moran and Andrey Gromyko ended an hour ago--a report on this from Juan Antonio Sacaluga:

This afternoon Moran and Gromyko added another 2 and 1/2 hours to their talks over the past couple of days in Madrid. To begin with, the foreign ministers met accompanied only by their ambassadors, and then they convened their respective delegations. After the meeting, Foreign Minister Moran did not want to make pronouncement on behalf of the government on the U.S. "star wars" plan. Asked whether he shared Moscow's concern over the subject he said:

[Begin recording] I share my own concern, that of my country, that of the government. I repeat that it is a highly complex subject, a very delicate one, and one which is conceptually difficult. We shall inform the country of our, let's say, our [words indistinct] at the appropriate time. [end recording]

For his part, Gromyko only made a brief statement and avoided making any forecast on the arms control negotiations:

[Begin Gromyko recording in Russian with superimposed Spanish] On, I'm not going to make any forecasts now, you know. I think that that question concerns our [words indistinct]. Yesterday I said [words indistinct]. But as far as the talks are concerned then--as they say--we shall see. The Soviet Union wants success at the forthcoming talks, but it is not only on us that everything depends. It depends on both powers--the United States and the Soviet Union. Well, gentlemen, that's it. [end recording]

Gromyko Leaves; No Communique Issued

PA021316 Madrid EFE in Spanish 1019 GMT 2 Mar 85

[Excerpts] Madrid, 2 Mar (EFE)--Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko left Spain today following a 48-hour visit, during which he warned about the

dangers of the so-called "star wars." His Spanish counterpart Fernando Moran claimed for the Spanish Government the will to maintain "a certain autonomy" in the defense of the West of which Spain is a part "for obvious reasons." Gromyko returned to Moscow at 1000 this morning (0900 GMT) after meeting in Madrid with King Juan Carlos, Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez, and Moran.

The visit concluded with the signing of three bilateral cooperation agreements, but without a joint communique. Gromyko invited Gonzalez to pay an official visit to Moscow this year. In his talks with Spanish officials, Gromyko discussed the next Geneva negotiations on arms control, the Central American and Mideast crises, and Spain's presence in NATO.

The 76-year old Soviet minister expressed the desire of his government to increase relations between the two countries and, in a clear reference to the United States, said that he hopes that such ties would not hurt "third countries."

According to Moran, at no time during the talks did Gromyko pressure him or give him advice about Spain's presence in NATO. "We accept pressure from no one," he had stated on Thursday when he received Gromyko at the Madrid airport.

In the past few months, the United States has decided to speed up the program for antimissile tests known as "star wars." The space shuttle will be used, beginning in 1987, to carry out experiments to detect, follow, and find targets in space.

At the same time, the Americans maintain that the USSR has become the "only" country that has antisatellite weapons.

In his talks in Madrid, Gromyko conditioned progress in the Geneva negotiations, which are to start on 12 March, to the U.S. abandonment of the "star wars" projects. "The Soviet Union wants peace, but everything does not depend on us; it also depends on the other big power," he said. Gromyko, as well as Moran, refused to predict the results of these negotiations.

CSO: S200/2521

SPACE ARMS

POSITION ON MILITARY USES OF SPACE PRESENTED

Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 4 Mar 85 p 6

[Interview with Dr Gyula Gal, chief legal counsellor and member of the directorate of the International Astronautical Federation, by Gabor Pal Petho: "What Is Not Permitted Even In Free Space"]

[Excerpts] [Question] What was the main subject under discussion last fall in Lausanne, at the congress of the International Astronautical Federation?

[Answer] The commercial and economic utilization of space was an important theme under discussion. Experts from the United States especially gave many talks on this, which is understandable because this question is at an advanced stage in the United States; private enterprises are playing an ever greater role in space activity, together with NASA. The question was how we should interpret the basic thesis of space law, the freedom of space activity, whether it applied to economic associations or enterprises participating in this activity or to the states. It is generally recognized that space activity is permitted to states. The space law agreement signed in 1967 and ratified by virtually every country--including ours--contained this thesis also. But at that time only the INTELSAT international communications artificial satellite network, privately owned, was in operation, so not so much emphasis was given to the stipulation that this activity was taking place with the responsibility of the states. Another important theme at Lausanne was the harmony of space law and the internal legal relationships of the several states; there are more and more space activities by virtue of which the legal regulation of space activity is being included in the law of the individual states.

[Question] The experts at scientific meetings do not represent their governments but rather express their own opinions. To what extent can they implement in their countries the views crystallized in a scientific debate?

[Answer] That is a difficult question. For example we must sadly note that the opinion of American experts taking a realistic and peace loving position is not realized very much in the state policy of their country. A glaring example of this was reported in the middle of January this year by the prestigious daily THE WASHINGTON POST. It described a new edition of a 15-page handbook formulating the strategy used by the U.S. Air force, aimed

by General Charles A. Gabriel, chief of staff of the Air Force, from which it appears that they have finally adopted an "aerospace" conception opposed not only to the opinion of lawyers but also opposed to talks conducted with the Soviet Union.

[Question] This combined English word seems to have a great many meanings.

[Answer] There is no need to struggle with the translation; it is clear from the article of the well informed paper that this handbook establishes the uniform strategic treatment of space. It states as a guiding principle for the activities of the Air Force that both airspace and interplanetary space can be scenes for military operations, that there is no separate airspace and interplanetary space, but only a uniform vertical space in which the Air Force must carry out the same strategy.

A Province for Mankind

[Question] If I understand you, the socialist space science and space law conception rejects this conception?

[Answer] Absolutely! According to our conception--which is shared by many lawyers in capitalist countries--we are talking about two types of space with radically different legal status; the countries beneath have territorial sovereignty in the airspace, but interplanetary space is free. In plain language, the airspace can be entered--for example by passenger carrying aircraft--only with the permission of the authorities of the country involved. In contrast to this the interplanetary space is free like, for example, the open sea--although the simile is rather inappropriate. Everyone can navigate there as they wish. (The boundary between the airspace and interplanetary space is a debated question, but most agree that it is approximately at an altitude of 100 kilometers, where orbital activity, movement in an orbit around the Earth, becomes possible.) But there is a restriction--that it is forbidden to deploy nuclear weapons for other weapons of mass destruction on objects or celestial bodies, for example the Moon, moving in free interplanetary space (this is another reason why the open sea simile is inappropriate). As for the Moon, the signatories to the agreement have agreed on absolute demilitarization. No sort of military equipment can be placed there, nor can experiments with such things be conducted there. To avoid misunderstanding, devices producing nuclear energy can be placed on artificial satellites, etc, and military personnel can participate in experiments for peaceful purposes.

There is another item in the 1967 treaty which every state accepts, they only interpret it differently. The treaty states that research in space is a province for mankind.

[Question] It is understandable that they were able to agree on the complete demilitarization of the Moon in 1967; at that time no one had yet landed on the surface of the Moon; this happened only in 1969. But it seems to contradict the treaty that artificial satellites with military purposes, namely intelligence gathering, reconnaissance satellites, are in operation--

although the treaty forbade military activity in space. How do the lawyers reconcile this with the treaty adopted?

[Answer] There are two sorts of concepts in connection with this. According to one military activity in space is not forbidden--if it is not of an offensive character. According to the other concept the expression "peaceful use" means absolutely non-military use, so all space activity for military purposes is forbidden, because--according to the treaty--all activity in space can be conducted only for the good of every state while military activity--even defensive activity--serves the good of only one or a few states. I need not say that the space lawyers of the socialist countries, in harmony with the state policy of their countries, support this latter position.

The Big Spy Satellite

[Question] If space is free then the big communications intercept ("spy") satellite recently launched by the American spaceship Discovery into geostationary orbit 36,000 kilometers above the Soviet Union does not violate the law either?

[Answer] The SALT I agreement--which both great powers ratified--and the SALT II agreement, which did not become law but which is tacitly adhered to, prescribed or authorized the verification of arms limitations with "national tools" (since they could not agree on international verification), that is, the use of artificial observer satellites. But this does not apply to the present satellite because the agreement authorized these artificial satellites only to verify these treaties, only in regard to the Soviet Union and the United States and only with the condition that the activity of them was not camouflaged. The present geostationary satellite does not fit into this system of conditions; among other things it does not because it was camouflaged or secret--it is another question that news of it leaked out. In addition, one might compare the use of such a satellite, launched to monitor the radio communications of a sovereign country, with the gigantic outrage evoked in the United States every time it is discovered that the telephone of someone there has been tapped--for example, at the time Kissinger was secretary they tapped the phones of two dozen journalists and employees of the Department of State--when in these cases what is usually involved is only whether someone is chatting about state secrets or confidential information to unauthorized people. But to listen in on another country, a country together with which the greatest war in the history of both countries was waged and with which discussions are being held--well, I believe that there is no need to comment on this.

[Question] Space law is law too--and every law gets violated.... Unfortunately there is no court here which might pass judgment or enforce its judgment. So there is nothing to be done but to seek a negotiated agreement.

[Answer] And in the meantime the lawyers should try to develop common views and win the support of public opinion for them so that the states also can conduct a policy of peace. We are working on this.

SPACE ARMS

WEST EUROPE'S REACTION TO 'STAR WARS' EXAMINED

HK021030 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 2 Apr 85 p 7

["International Jottings" by Lin Sheng: "An Unpleasant 'Invitation'"]

[Text] To dispel the misgivings of the West European allies on the U.S. "star wars" plan, the United States is ready to let West European countries participate in working out the plan in the hope of their benefiting technologically. At a recent NATO nuclear group meeting, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger formally extended an "invitation" to the allies. But Weinberger set a deadline for the invitation, requiring them to reply within 2 months. This aroused dissatisfaction among the West European countries. Even official West German opinion, which actively supports the "star wars" plan, indignantly indicated: The deadline set by Weinberger "can be regarded as practically blackmail."

The West European countries have a lot of misgivings about the U.S. "star wars" plan: First, they are afraid that the U.S.-Soviet arms race will escalate and the situation will become tense; second, they fear that this plan will disconnect the U.S.-European defense system and that the United States will protect itself to the neglect of Western Europe; and third, they are worried that some West European countries will lose their independent nuclear capability. As an ally of Western Europe, if the United States is willing to think about the position of the West European countries carefully, it will feel that such misgivings are not unreasonable and are worth considering.

However, the United States assumed the posture of being a cut above others and issued orders to its allies from on high. This attitude is a bit too arrogant. Washington has indicated time and again that it will respect its allies and strengthen negotiations with them. But the U.S. defense secretary did not even show respect for others when he spoke in this way, to say nothing of negotiating. No wonder the West European allies became indignant.

CSO: 5200/4017

SPACE ARMS

NATO DEFENSE MINISTERS DISCUSS NUCLEAR PLANS

OW270809 Beijing XINHUA in English 0713 GMT 27 Mar 85

[Text] Luxembourg, 26 Mar (XINHUA)--Defense ministers from 14 NATO nations who met Tuesday to discuss the removal of the alliance's aging short-range nuclear weapons were invited by U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger to join a U.S. research program on space weapons, known as the "star wars" program, according to conference sources.

General Bernard Rogers, NATO's supreme allied commander, presented a report on how the alliance should carry out a 1983 decision to streamline its tactical nuclear forces in Europe, by withdrawing 1,400 warheads and modernizing the remaining 4,600.

Weinberger told the ministers that official invitations were being sent Tuesday to all the allied governments, plus "friendly nations" France, Japan, Australia and Israel.

Weinberger asked the allied governments to reply formally whether they are interested in participating in the 26-billion-dollar five-year research program, and to identify the areas in which they would be best qualified to contribute.

West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner justified the research effort on grounds that the Soviet Union has not stopped its research program into space-based defenses; that no protest has been made against the Soviet program; and that the U.S. program has been a major factor in forcing the Soviets back to the arms control talks in Geneva.

Some West European countries have misgivings about the "star wars" program. France, Europe's leading space power, has been cool to the idea. France plays no part in NATO nuclear planning group.

In Denmark, a parliamentary majority last week voted to protest the stationing of weapons in space and to keep Denmark out of any research or production of such weapons.

The two-day meeting presided over by NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington is not expected to produce any initiatives on NATO nuclear weapons policy, but the ministers were likely to reiterate their support for the American position at the Geneva arms talks.

SPACE ARMS

FRG UNDECIDED ABOUT SPACE DEFENSE RESEARCH

OW271956 Beijing XINHUA in English 1935 GMT 27 Mar 85

[Text] Bonn, 27 Mar (XINHUA)--The West German Government said today that it had not decided whether to join the United States in its research on a space defense system.

The declaration is in response to an earlier U.S. invitation to its allies to take part in the research work.

The government said that the work carried out by the United States in this field is "justifiable" since the Soviet Union had already started to do so.

The West German Government welcomed the U.S. statement that it will not seek nuclear superiority and stressed the need for the U.S. to hold "continuous and active consultations" with the allies.

It said that the allied nations should not change their strategy of a flexible response before more effective means are found to prevent war.

It called for an unanimous stand by the allies on political and strategic issues and said that consultations should help strengthen the position taken by the west in the Geneva talks.

The West German Government hopes that arms race both in space and on earth would stop, the declaration said.

It expressed the desire that the United States and the USSR seek a "cooperative settlement" on the issue of the space defense system.

CSO: 5200/4010

SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

FRANCO-SOVIET MILITARY CONSULTATIONS--(TASS, March 6)--As agreed, Soviet-French consultations on the question of preventing militarization of outer space were held here on 5 March. Taking part in them from the Soviet side was Admiral Nikolay Amelko, deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, and from the French side Admiral G. de Brusson, deputy chief of staff of the French Armed Forces. [Text] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Mar 85 p 5]

CSO: 520C/1027

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

GORBACHEV ANNOUNCES INF DEPLOYMENT MORATORIUM IN EUROPE

Gorbachev Interview

PH071608 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 85 First Edition p 1

["M.S. Gorbachev Interview With the Editor of the Newspaper PRAVDA" — PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Question: Our newspaper has received many letters -- from Soviet people and from abroad -- devoted to international affairs. Now, Mikhail Sergeyevich, would you describe the international situation?

Answer: I understand the increased interest in international affairs. The broad people's masses on all continents are striving to exert an active influence on the fate of the modern world.

This is not fortuitous. The world is full of complex problems -- political, social, and economic alike. Two opposed social systems -- socialism and capitalism -- exist in reality. Dozens of new states with their history, traditions, and interests are active in the international arena. This is also a reality.

To build international relations in the present-day world, it is impossible to disregard this, to ignore the interests of other states, and especially to attempt to deprive them of their rights to choose their own path of development. In broad terms, this is also the policy of peaceful coexistence, whereby each system's attempts to prove which of them is better by force of example not by force of arms.

Another conclusion which is equally topical is the need to end the arms race. The development of the international situation has reached a point where the questions arise: Where do you go from here? Is it not time for the figures who determine states' policies to stop, ponder, and not allow the adoption of decisions which would push the world toward a nuclear catastrophe?

There is an urgent need for international cooperation in organizing dialogue and seeking realistic decisions that would ease tension in the world and help bar the way to the arms race.

All states -- large and small alike -- must participate in this. It is understandable that the nuclear powers and primarily the Soviet Union and the United States have a special role to play.

Our country has pursued and will continue to pursue an active and constructive foreign policy for the sake of strengthening peace. This was reaffirmed at the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum, where the Soviet state's foreign policy principles were spelled out.

Question: A great deal in the world is linked with the state of Soviet-American relations. In your view, have opportunities emerged for a change for the better in them?

Answer: Relations between the USSR and the United States are an exceptionally important factor in international politics, but we do not look at the world solely through the prism of these relations. We realize the importance of other countries in international affairs and take this into account in assessing the general situation in the world.

Are there changes for the better in Soviet-American relations at this time? There is no simple answer to this question. Some things give grounds for hope, but there continue to be a considerable and even great number of things that inspire anxiety.

The new Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons have begun in Geneva. This is a positive fact. Together with the United States, we determined the subject and objective of the talks, and, to put it concisely, we determined them as follows: to not start an arms race in space, end the arms race on earth, and embark on a radical reduction of nuclear arms with the ultimate objective of totally eliminating them.

This accord must now be implemented. The talks are important. I say this primarily because the question of where the development of Soviet-American relations and developments in the world as a whole go from here is now being decided. The choice is as follows: either an arms race in all areas and the growth of the war threat or the consolidation of general security and a more stable peace for all.

There is some movement [kakiye-to podvizhki] in other fields of Soviet-American relations, but it is very slight. On the whole relations remain tense.

Washington is gambling on force and making no secret of the fact. It is counting on superior force that would subordinate the rest of the world to the United States. Diplomacy and negotiations are literally subordinate to missiles and bombers there, for it is a fact that new strategic arms programs are being forced through Congress by those people who are conducting the talks in Geneva on behalf of the United States.

Everybody has heard a considerable amount about the "star wars" plans proclaimed by the U.S. Administration. The vocabulary sounds as if it has been taken from science fiction, but an attempt is being made to use it to conceal a real and awful danger for our planet. I would use the term fantastic to describe the arguments cited to justify the militarization of space. They talk about defense but are preparing for attack, they advertise a space shield but are forging a space sword, they promise to eliminate nuclear weapons but in practice are building up and improving them. They promise the world stability but are moving toward breaking the military equilibrium.

Since people can intuitively sense the danger of the "star wars" plans, the authors of these plans want to make people believe that it is a question of innocuous scientific research, research that even promises technological benefits. Using this lure, they also want to make their allies accomplices in the dangerous venture.

It is even asserted that the elimination of nuclear weapons can be achieved through the creation of space weapons. This is a deception. Just as the emergence of nuclear weapons did not eliminate conventional types of weapons but only gave rise to an accelerated nuclear and conventional arms race, so the creation of space weapons will have just one result -- the arms race will become even more intensive and encompass new spheres.

I have singled out the factors that are primarily complicating Soviet-American relations and at times bring them to the verge of acute tension. Here it appears that some people in the United States regard this situation as normal, considering confrontation virtually a natural state.

We do not consider this to be the case. Confrontation is not an inherent defect in our relations. Rather it is an anomaly. There is nothing inevitable about its continuation. We regard the improvement of Soviet-American relations as not only extremely necessary but possible. Of course, it is impossible to manage without reciprocity here.

Question: The possibility of you meeting with the U.S. President is generating great interest. What are the prospects here?

Answer: The question of such a meeting has been touched upon in our correspondence with President Reagan. I can say that a positive attitude to holding such a meeting has been expressed from both sides. The timing and venue for holding it will be the subject of subsequent agreement.

In broader terms, the correspondence discussed finding joint ways to improve relations between the USSR and the United States and making them more stable and constructive. I am convinced that a serious impetus must be given to Soviet-American relations at a high political level. We propose to the U.S. Government that matters be conducted in such a way that everyone -- our peoples and other countries -- can see that the political courses of the USSR and the United States are directed not toward enmity and confrontation but toward the search for mutual understanding and toward peaceful development.

Question: It is clear from what you have said, Mikhail Sergeyevich, that there is a need for action on a broad front. Nevertheless, what do you see as the main lever for a substantial turnabout?

Answer: Intensive mutual efforts, indeed efforts across a broad front. Mutual understanding on the need to promote the settlement of conflict situations in the world would have a beneficial influence on our relations and on international relations. A considerable amount could also be done to our mutual benefit in the development of bilateral ties between the USSR and the United States.

Nevertheless, what you called the main lever lies in the field of security. From what specific point could it be possible to start here?

Since, we have sat down at the table to seek agreement on reducing arms, it is necessary at least not to increase them. Therefore, we propose, that for the entire duration of the talks the USSR and the United States impose a moratorium on the development -- including scientific research work -- testing, and deployment of space strike weapons and freeze their strategic offensive weapons. Simultaneously, there must be a halt to the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and, correspondingly, to the buildup of our countermeasures.

The American leaders state that they advocate radical arms reductions. If this is so, it is logical to first stop the arms race and immediately move on to reductions.

We are in favor of honest dialogue. We are again prepared to demonstrate our goodwill. From this date [sегодня] -- I wish to stress -- The Soviet Union is imposing a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and is suspending [priostanavlivayet] the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe. The moratorium will be in effect until November this year. The decision we make thereafter depends on whether the United States follows our example, or whether it stops the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Europe.

Summing up, I would say the following: Opportunities do exist for improving Soviet-American relations and improving the general international situation. These opportunities must not be missed; they must be translated into specific policies and practical decisions.

U.S. Response Criticized

LD081127 Moscow TASS in English 1109 GMT 8 Apr 85

["Old Songs in New Arrangement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

Washington has hastily dismissed the USSR's new peace initiatives. Larry Speakes, deputy press secretary of the White House, has said that the Soviet Union's unilateral introduction of a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles till November and suspension of other counter-measures in Europe will not affect the American plans of deploying Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western European countries.

Thus, Washington has ignored yet one more time the logical and clear call -- since the sides have sat down at the table to negotiate the reduction of arms, let us not at least build up them. It seems that the U.S. Administration wishes neither this, nor the other -- neither the arms reduction, nor the renunciation of the arms buildup. It seems that despite the White House's peace rhetoric, President Ronald Reagan's "directive" remains in force: One can argue only on what weapons are necessary, and what not, but not on whether the United States should give up weapons for the sake of treaties and accords.

However, the White House has to cover its negative attitude in one way or another, so administration officials are taking off the shelf their state "arguments" and claim that a halt in the deployment of U.S. missiles would be tantamount to preserving "the already immense superiority" of the USSR in medium-range missiles. It is an unobjective view, to put it mildly, or a gross lie, to put it straightly. While comparing the strength of the sides only in ground-launched missiles, the U.S. leaders deliberately ignore the American forward-based nuclear systems and also exclude from the count the British and French systems, as if they were non-existent.

In reality the situation is entirely different from what official Washington tries to tell the public. Before Pershing II and cruise missiles began to be deployed in Europe, there existed rough parity in the number of medium-range systems, while NATO had an about 50 per cent superiority in the total number of warheads on medium-range missiles and planes. After the United States began to deploy new missiles in Western Europe, the

USSR had to take measures in response to prevent the balance from being tipped. All those measures have been kept within the limits prompted by the U.S. actions, which means that the balance of forces has been preserved. Nevertheless, deluding the public and carrying on its policy "from strength," Washington stubbornly claims that it would continue to build up its medium-range missiles in Europe. It is irresponsible and dangerous policy!

The same line is followed by Washington in the sphere of space weapons. Statements of U.S. officials make it clear that the U.S. is not ready to analyze the question on any freeze or on any other forms of discussion of American programs of the militarization of outer space till the stages of the "research" are over, i.e. till the weapons themselves are created. Moreover, the U.S. intends to implement the programs irrespective of what arms reductions will be agreed upon in Geneva. In other words, Washington openly counts on the deployment of a new class of armaments dangerous for the cause of peace.

So, why create space weapons if there exists a possibility to dramatically reduce nuclear offensive armaments by means of negotiations up to their complete elimination? The Soviet Union states firmly and authoritatively that it would be logical to stop the arms race and to immediately pass over to arms reductions. However, in fact today's "pace-makers" from Washington do not want anything of it. The U.S. tried to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union through the arms race on the earth, but saw for itself that the attempt ended in failure. Today, instead of coming to the right conclusions and accepting Soviet proposals, Washington strives to draw the USSR into a new round of the arms race in order to achieve military superiority over it, this time through a space arms race.

It is time to give up these unrealistic intentions and not to miss possibilities to improve Soviet-American relations and the international situation in general. It is necessary through joint efforts to direct these possibilities into the plane of concrete policies and practical decisions.

U.S. 'Goodwill Gestures' Urged

LD051834 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 5 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva April 5 TASS -- TASS special correspondent Vladimir Bogachev reports:

The Soviet Union's proposals on a freeze on the nuclear arsenals of the sides, an end to the deployment of new American missiles in Europe with a simultaneous discontinuation of the buildup of Soviet counter-measures are a subject of a lively discussion in the journalistic circles in Geneva. While evaluating Washington's negative reaction to these peace initiatives of the USSR, the journalists draw the conclusion that the American side either has not outlined its stand that would enable it to hold talks successfully, or it is deliberately playing for time in the hope to use the Geneva talks as a screen to cover the buildup of nuclear and space weapons by the United States.

It is pointed here that the White House resolutely rejects any proposals by American political figures, whose realization could be taken as a goodwill gesture of the USA.

American Senator John Kerry has tabled in Congress a bill on introduction by the United States of a moratorium on the testing of anti-satellite weapons. In so doing, he stressed that the Soviet Union has already announced such a moratorium. The adoption

by Washington of John Kerry's proposal would be the first and sole practical step of the USA even in a limited field of curbing the arms race over the past four years. Deplorably, judging by public statements by U.S. Administration officials, there are practically no chances that Washington will make such a goodwill gesture.

Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter has urged the Reagan administration the other day to ratify the Soviet-American SALT-2 treaty of 1979 and to prolong its term for another five years. In his reply, President Reagan even refused to promise that the USA would observe the terms of that treaty till the end of 1985.

The reaction of the White House to charges of being insincere in its statements on striving for nuclear disarmament is very peculiar indeed. In recent weeks, Washington has launched a whole series of propaganda actions aimed at distracting world public attention from the practical measures of the USA to militarise outer space and to build up nuclear weapons on earth, blaming the Soviet Union for the very same misdeeds against the cause of peace, which are committed by the United States.

It claims that the United States wishes to "end the process of erosion of the ABM Treaty with the Soviet Union", albeit U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger quite recently described it as a "pseudo-agreement on arms control", and his assistant Richard Perle openly declared Washington's intention to give up this most important agreement.

Things have gone so far that President Reagan is, apparently, ready to renounce the dubious laurels of being the author of the "star wars" plans. According to a report in the American newspaper INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, official representatives of the USA now claim that the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" is partially (sic) a reaction to the Soviet Union's similar programmes.

Donald Lowitz, U.S. representative at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, demagogically declared that Washington wishes a cut by both sides in offensive nuclear weapons, precisely at the time when his colleague Max Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation at the talks with the USSR, was urgently summoned to Washington in order to push through the Congress a programme of an unrestrained build up of the very same offensive systems.

Such are the facts which completely refute Washington's cock-and-bull stories about those who are responsible for the dangerous destabilisation of the situation in the world.

CSO: 5200/1077

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PAPER COMMENTS ON NORDIC ZONE IN LIGHT OF SOBOLEV STATEMENT

Helsinki UUSI SUOMI in Finnish 27 Feb 85 p 2

[Editorial: "A Stable Northern Europe"]

[Text] The fact that no gaudy controversy has arisen in the discussion engaged in over the security of Northern Europe is in itself cheering, even though the ambassadors of two members of military alliances participated in it besides representatives of the neutral countries. The preservation of the stable situation that has continued for a long time in Northern Europe seems to be in the common interests of both the East and the West.

Between the lines and on the lines too, messages were certainly conveyed to the other side, but in a very cautious way.

Thus Soviet Ambassador Vladimir Sobolev criticized NATO's intensification of military activity, emphasizing especially military exercises. Norwegian Ambassador Olav Bucher-Johannessen, on the other hand, alluded to Soviet activity in the North Sea, arguing on the basis of this the need for stocking NATO base equipment.

All things considered, at political editor sessions the security of Northern Europe has, however, been viewed as a structure that rests on many pillars, one in which the wavering of even one pillar might rock the whole structure. The animated political debate in Norway and Sweden did not touch on the basic issues at all, representatives of the countries involved emphasized.

It is worth noting the strong emphasis Swedish Ambassador Knut Thyberg at the time laid on Sweden's Armed Forces. Sweden's unilateral disarmament or sharp reduction in its defense arrangements would, according to him, only lead to uncertainty in the region.

Foreign Affairs Minister Paavo Vayrynen also stressed the fact that Finland must see to its defense capability "in a convincing manner."

Very strongly emphasizing the fact, the Swedish ambassador also informed the Soviet Union that in Stockholm foreign policy is not handled on the basis of ideological sympathies and that there is no campaign in progress against any

union. So they are still trying to improve relations with the Soviet Union that have been damaged by the submarine incident.

Since the basic situation in Northern Europe is stable, the discussion was focused on a nuclear-free Nordic zone and the corresponding initiatives. Decisive at this time is perhaps not whether they implement the initiatives — nor, especially, advancing the timetable. The discussion is in itself a beneficial, tension-reducing process.

The Norwegian ambassador, of course, repeated his country's condition that a nuclear-free zone will only be possible as part of a more extensive arrangement. They do not, however, reject the idea itself in Oslo — unlike their attitude in past years. The conditions for it are, on the contrary, being systematically determined.

In the course of the discussion Ambassador Sobolev essentially clarified the Soviet position with regard to its contribution to a nuclear-free zone by stating that the arrangement cannot involve the Soviet Union's own territory. It would undoubtedly be troublesome or highly theoretical as well to declare some part of a nuclear power to be free of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union is, however, still ready to make its contribution to an arrangement as concerns the Baltic — which ought to especially interest Sweden, which has been searching for submarines — and to do so in the form of guarantees. Even if only from the standpoint of public opinion and so-called perspective, the fact that the Soviet Union, as a country that borders on Northern Europe, will make a concrete contribution to the matter is a positive development.

Foreign Affairs Minister Vayrynen also launched a test balloon at the meeting for a sequel to the Stockholm CSCE. In themselves very few things were discussed at the Stockholm conference, issues like the supervision of military exercises. However, the process itself is important — the fact that matters can be discussed. In light of this, new, properly advanced ideas will certainly be beneficial.

11,466

CSO: 5200/251d

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR POWERS

FOREIGN MINISTRY SEES LESS URGENCY FOR ZONE TALKS

Helsinki UPI SUOMI in Finnish 27 Feb 85 p 1

[Text] Finland's parliamentary representatives feel that next fall is a suitable time for a joint conference of Nordic parliamentarians, even though the Foreign Affairs Ministry does not feel that now is the right time for an agreement on a nuclear-free Northern Europe and even though the Soviet Union will not permit its own territory to be included in such a zone.

Speaker of Parliament Erkki Pystynen has called a meeting tomorrow night of parliamentary delegations and parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee representatives to discuss a joint conference of the Nordic countries.

In the opinion of the chairman of the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee, Erkki Liikanen (Social Democrat), the matter will, among other things, be helped by the fact that, in addition to the Swedish Government, the Norwegian and Danish parliaments regard the realization of a nuclear-free zone favorably.

In Liikanen's opinion, a conference will at least provide an opportunity for discussion by Nordic parliamentary representatives, even if unanimity on the part of all participants on a completely satisfactory declaration is not achieved.

In the opinion of Conservative Party delegation leader Ulla Puolanne, a conference of parliamentary representatives must strive to come up with a declaration that is as clear as possible, even if it is not possible to get the governments to assume binding positions on the matter.

"It may take months," Puolanne said.

Vice speaker of Parliament Mikko Pesala (Center Party) is also of the opinion that we must strive to achieve a nuclear-free Northern Europe. On Tuesday Foreign Affairs Minister Paavo Vayrynen did not feel that the present was opportune enough for us to be able to set a timetable for an agreement on a nuclear-free Northern Europe.

11,466

CGO: 5200/7518

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

LE SOIR VIEWS PROGRESS ON MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

PM251253 Brussels LE SOIR in French 22 Feb 85 pp 1, 2

[Francis Nwin report: "Cruise Missiles Deployed in Florennes in March or...June?"]

[Text] The Foreign Ministry spokesman announced yesterday that Mr Tindemans had completed his consultations with the NATO allies on the timetable for the deployment of cruise missiles in Belgium by receiving NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington. It was an announcement which caused some surprise, especially because of the way in which it was expressed.

Indeed, in principle, Mr Tindemans was not due to have another meeting with Lord Carrington. According to the most recent reports, there had not officially been any multilateral consultations with our allies at the NATO ambassador level.

The spokesmen were therefore forced, against their will, to contradict themselves, because multilateral consultations did take place. When? It is not known. Mr Tindemans had another meeting with the NATO secretary general. This shows once again the degree to which there is a mania for little secrets in our country on everything, even when there is no reason for it.

The new element is that the Tindemans report is ready and will probably be submitted to Mr Martens today. This report notes that, with the exception of Greece and, to a lesser extent, Denmark, all the allies urged Belgium to honor the timetable for the deployment of the Euromissiles drawn up by NATO in 1979.

In other words, an initial battery of 16 cruise missiles should be deployed in Florennes sometime next month.

Mr Martens will submit the report to the cabinet for a decision "at his convenience." Everything is therefore now in the prime minister's hands. If the very principle of the consultations is upheld ("our allies will decide for us"), there is no longer any reason for hesitation; but Belgian politics being what they are, once again things are obviously not as clear as this.

For instance, it is not impossible that even if the "final political decision" on the deployment of the missiles is in fact made quickly, deployment itself may be delayed until the end of June. This would in practice be a response to the request made on Monday by the office of the Christian Labor Movement [ACW], the CVP's Christian Democratic wing. It is also what Mr Tindemans advocated for a time, in the absence of a better solution, when the ACW seemed more radically hostile to the very principle of cruise deployment than it is now.

Will there be a return to this position, willingly or unwillingly, which -- in addition to many other drawbacks -- would have the advantage of making it possible to take delivery of the missiles right in the middle of the summer truce and the parliamentary recess? In any case, it would contradict the desire, frequently expressed recently, to work quickly, to enable the CVP to focus its election campaign on less dangerous subjects. In principle, it is difficult to see what the CVP would stand to gain from further delays, even if they were accompanied by a "political decision in principle."

How to Back Down?

Mr Martens is probably more aware of this than anybody. Especially since, under the very terms of the consultation procedure chosen by the Belgian Government, it is in principle no longer possible to back down: We have placed ourselves in the hands of our allies, who have "urged" us to honor the deployment timetable. The prime minister also knows, however, that he is not on very safe ground. The embarrassment of such an experienced journalist as Manu Ruys of DE STANDAARD is significant. While remarking on Tuesday that the ACW deputies are only committed to the CPV, he questioned the validity of this interpretation himself.

Finally, there is increasing talk of a "package deal" between the Liberals and the CVP faction, which has not abandoned its hostility to the missiles: If the former moderated their demands in the fiscal sphere, the latter would make a gesture on the deployment of the cruise missiles. The Liberals conceded yesterday evening that it might be possible to consider "whether there is not an unreasonable technical delay between the political decision to deploy and implementation." But Jean Gol, the "big boss," will decide...

If it takes place, this general deal would, as a foreign observer who knows us well said, be very characteristic of Belgian politics. Indeed, this give and take would bring about the implementation of an international obligation (regarded as such by all the protagonists in our "missile war," whatever their disagreements about the way of honoring the said obligation, and a commitment which stemmed exclusively from Belgian domestic policy -- a commitment made by one or several political parties...

Is everything in Mr Martens' hands? As far as it can be in Belgium...

Meanwhile, the government is mobilized for this Friday, this weekend, and possibly the following few days.

CSO: 52002513

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

L'UNITA VIEWS STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

PM061549 Rome L'UNITA in Italian 27 Feb 85 p 4

[Article by Marco De Andries of the International Affairs Institute: "Space Weapons -- an Impenetrable Space Shield Is Inconceivable"]

[Text] Norman Podhoretz is the editor of the conservative American magazine COMMENTARY. Writing recently in THE NEW YORK TIMES, he summarized in a few pages the deep aversion which the U.S. right has for arms control -- which is bluntly compared to the attitude adopted by the democracies toward Nazism in the thirties. The conclusion is interesting. According to the author we must stop believing in negotiations in general and instead trust in the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI -- in other words, Star Wars -- L'UNITA editor's note), which allegedly represents "a rational promise of finally escaping from the threat of nuclear war." We will soon see to what extent this "promise" is rational. However, it should be stated immediately that on 12 February Reagan adopted these ideas in part when he reaffirmed that the SDI is not negotiable. However, this is not the best atmosphere for the start of the Geneva talks, since the Soviets have repeatedly said for some time that they do not intend to sign agreements which exclude space weapons.

A basic mistake in all the discussions on this kind of celestial Maginot line proposed by Reagan 2 years ago is that it is taken at face value. In other words, people believe it can be achieved, and then carefully examine the repercussions of its deployment -- if the term can be used in connection with something which is destined to be suspended between heaven and earth. For instance, many European experts are worrying about what will happen to "coupling" -- the alleged identification of West Europe's defense with U.S. defense -- if the United States had an ABM shield. Many advocates of Star Wars -- especially Weinberger -- are explaining that the Soviet intermediate-range missiles targeted on Europe would still be under fire.

There are even people like the Italian, Caligaris, who think that a new U.S. invulnerability would take the strategic balance back to the golden age, in other words to the fifties. However, they fail to consider the fact that the European -- and especially the German -- version of "coupling" presupposes precisely American vulnerability. If this were not the case, the Englishman Lawrence Freedman wrote, "The United States could withdraw behind a protective shield...or, worse still, trusting in its own security, could take increasingly dangerous initiatives in international policy, leaving the allies to suffer the consequences."

However, we are talking about the infeasibility of an effective space-based ABM defense. Let us see why it is not feasible. First, it is a good thing to agree on the concept of "efficacy": to render nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete," as Reagan said in March 1983, and as he reiterated recently, it is necessary to obtain a system capable of destroying a quantity of incoming warheads fairly close -- if not equal -- to 100 percent. The Soviet Union has around 8,000 warheads carried by strategic vehicles: if it ever used all of them in one attack and just 1 percent succeeded in penetrating the space shield, some 80 warheads could explode over the United States with a varying unit yield, but in each case between tens and hundreds of times greater than the Hiroshima bomb. Even if just a few eventually fell on cities, the damage could nonetheless be on an inconceivable scale. There is no need to add that if the number of nuclear warheads used in a single attack is increased, the absolute value of the hypothetical 1 percent which escapes interception increases.

But that is not all: The SDI is avowedly limited to ballistic missiles, and consequently it would not render "impotent and obsolete" the nuclear warheads on any vehicle which does not follow a ballistic trajectory: bombers, cruise missiles, or -- more simply -- terrorists. What is the likelihood, therefore, of this infallible ABM space defense functioning in a few decades time? According to an MIT report, published by the U.S. Congress' Office of Technology Assessment, there is very little likelihood of this. In general, countermeasures to a space shield "could be achieved with modern technology, whereas the defense system could not; the cost can be estimated and turns out relatively low, whereas the cost of the defense system is unknown but is probably high; the future technologies which it is thought will form part of the defense system would also be powerful weapons for attacking the defense system itself."

This final point conflicts with another of Reagan's promises -- that of sharing the space Maginot line with the Soviets: In such a climate of deep distrust between the two superpowers, would the Americans really run the risk of enemy using the technology gift to strive to circumvent the defense system?

With regard to the technology, we now know the range of what is being taken into consideration for the defensive "level" alone, which is intended to strike the missiles at the launch stage -- there are then two other levels, one to hit the missile when it is traveling outside the atmosphere, and a final level to hit it when it is reentering the atmosphere. The devices range from ground-based chemical lasers with reflecting mirrors in orbit, to space-based lasers, and in this latter case also to x-rays produced by nuclear explosions; to orbital stations emitting particle beams, to microwave generators, and even to kinetic energy weapons and yet other hypotheses.

It is logical, therefore, that the cost of the research phase alone should be exorbitant: \$26 billion in the next 5 years, more or less the cost of the whole fleet of B-1 bombers, or around 3 years of Italian military spending. It is equally logical that, in an alliance which admits its own excessive dependence on nuclear weapons, explaining it by the Soviet conventional "superiority," somebody should think that \$26 billion could be better spent. What an American senator used to say about some military programs applies to the SDI: "The end is unattainable, the means ridiculous, and the cost exorbitant."

Although an impenetrable space shield is not within the realms of feasibility, this does not mean that the research will not continue. It is impossible to successfully defend cities and the civilian population; it is conceivable that some military installations and command centers might be protected. In fact, around half of the \$1.4 billion the United States will spend this year on SDI research is devoted to this goal. The army apparently thinks that a system to defend ballistic missile sites could be operational by the early nineties. Another advocate of such a solution is Max Kampelman, who is no less than the chief American negotiator for the forthcoming Geneva talks.

Although technologically a more realistic aim compared to Reagan's promises, the defense of missile sites could have an even more destabilizing impact. It would in effect cancel out the 1972 ABM treaty, which virtually banned this kind of weapon and which remains the major success in the history of arms control. As such, it is therefore of great symbolic value, even irrespective of its strategic merits, for those in Europe and the United States who believe in the importance of continuing the East-West dialogue.

If this is really what is at stake in the "Star Wars" debate, one wonders why the U.S. Administration has turned down such a dangerous path. The answer lies in the radically anti-Soviet and antidetente stances challenged at the beginning of this article. On the more strictly strategic level, they return to old postwar U.S. arguments and obsessions. First and foremost, the irrational fear that some day the USSR could unleash a disarming attack on the United States. However, an equally absurd remedy is being suggested to alleviate such an absurd fear: to trust in an inadequate defense capability, to end the dialogue, and to open the way to the arms race.

We believe it is necessary to beware in this Star Wars debate of the danger of being misled by the symbols used by that great communicator, Reagan. The first is that of defense as something to set against the immorality of nuclear attack. As we have said, we believe that this is a pious illusion colored by revanchist isolationism. The second is even more subtle, and it is the myth of technology as a panacea, whereby many people are afraid to state outright that the antimissile shield is not feasible, perhaps for fear of appearing "unprogressive."

We hope that at least the Italian Government, when it decides to speak out on the issue, will not be fettered by such myths.

CSO: 5200/2513

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

WEST OPPOSES AUXILIARY ARMS TALKS AT UN CONFERENCE

LD192108 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 19 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva March 19 TASS--The head of the Soviet delegation, Viktor Israelyan, speaking today at the Geneva disarmament conference on the issue of preventing nuclear war, pointed out that the risk of war sharply grows as a result of the adoption of new American programmes for building up and modernizing nuclear armaments, expanding the geographical framework of their deployment and transferring the arms race into outer space.

The attempts by a small group of Western states to prevent under invented pretexts the Geneva conference from fulfilling its commitments on this major issue of world politics run counter to the aspiration of the peoples all over the world. A considerable majority of attending delegations were authorized by their governments to conduct corresponding talks, for which there is a basis in the form of concrete proposals by socialist, nonaligned and neutral countries. It seems, however, that the group of Western countries toughened their stance on the matter and even object the establishment of a special auxiliary body of the conference, whatever its mandate.

Julio Carasales (Argentina) stressed the need to start practical consideration of the problem of preventing nuclear war. This problem is of vital interest for all states and peoples, he said.

Today's statement by American representative Donald Lowitz was vivid manifestation of the attempts to "outplay" the other side. He praised President Reagan's notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative," claiming contrary to reality that its implementation will help strengthen international security, reduce the war menace and even, paradoxically as it sounds, fully eliminate nuclear weapons.

The head of the Polish delegation, Stanislaw Turbanski, showed the total groundlessness of these "arguments." The development of new space weapons, he said, will have most disastrous consequences for political, military and economic stability in the world. The American doctrine is directed at achieving military superiority and gaining the first-strike capability without fearing a retaliatory strike. It will bring closer the threat of nuclear war, rather than pushing it back, and will escalate the nuclear arms race, undermine the existing system of treaties and agreements on disarmament and

torpedo the talks on these questions, including the just-started Geneva talks between the Soviet and American delegation.

A majority in the international community do not believe that the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" is of a scientific research nature and has no serious military and political importance, stressed Bulgaria's representative Konstantin Tellalov. Strategic stability in today's world depends wholly on whether we will be able to prevent the transformation of outer space into a new ever more dangerous area of the arms race. Before it is too late, it is necessary to put an obstacle in the way of the militarization of outer space.

CSO: 5200/1043

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

POLISH DELEGATE TO UN DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE SPEAKS OUT

Formal Address Delivered

LD131349 Warsaw PAP in English 1125 GMT 13 Feb 85

[By PAP correspondent Edward Dylawski]

[Text] Geneva, Feb. 12 -- Chief Polish delegate addressed the 40-nation U.N. Disarmament Conference here today, saying Poland welcomed last November's Soviet-proposed agreement between the USSR and U.S. on starting talks over nuclear and space weapons.

But the delegate, Ambassador Stanislaw Turbanski stressed that the U.S. neither gave up any of its programmes of winning military superiority nor stopped the deployment of its new nuclear-tipped missiles in Western Europe.

He recalled the resolutions of the 39th session of the U.N. General Assembly, which called for firm steps towards disarmament on the earth and in space, and the Delhi declaration on the issue.

He said the opinion of the international public as voiced in these declarations should be followed by concrete results at the disarmament conference, at which differences can be eliminated only through serious negotiations held in good will.

He called attention to a need for establishing appropriate working organs to take up the particular issues contained in the agenda of the conference.

The ambassador said he believed it was possible to achieve progress in the chemical weapons ban talks, but said that in view of a recent statement on the issue by head of the U.S. Agency for Arms Control and Disarmament Kenneth Adelman, he feared the prospects for success of the talks were less encouraging.

Chemical Weapons Ban

AU191108 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 16-17 Feb 85 pp 1-2

["Statement" given to RZECZPOSPOLITA by Ambassador Stanislaw Turbanski, chairman of the Geneva ad hoc Chemical Weapons Committee: "Expressions of Recognition for Poland"; date and place not given]

[Excerpts] In Geneva on 5 February, the disarmament conference started, in which representatives from 40 European, Asian, Africa, and American states are taking part. The conference is discussing the entire complex of problems connected with efforts to halt a further arms race and prevent nuclear war. A ban on chemical weapons is also an important topic in the conference.

One of the first decisions of the conference was to appoint an ad hoc Chemical Weapons Committee and entrust the chairmanship to Ambassador Stanislaw Turbanski, whom we have asked for a statement.

[Turbanski] My tasks will include work organization, consultations on various proposals, and the establishment of priority in dealing with individual problems in such a way that the most efficient course of the talks is guaranteed.

I will, so to speak, pilot the committee's work through the complex political and technical problems connected with a ban on chemical weapons and often the subject of opposing views and proposals. Here I wish to stress that entrusting Poland with the chairmanship of the committee is an expression of recognition for our country's activity for the sake of peace and disarmament, not only in Geneva, but also at other disarmament forums, as well as an expression of recognition for our long-standing dedicated work on banning chemical weapons.

Among the more important matters on which a considerable degree of accord has already been reached, I would mention the singling out of a group of supertoxins that will be subject to a total and unconditional ban. Less progress has been made concerning a discussion on less toxic substances, the production of which may continue, but only for peaceful purposes and under a specified form of control. Progress has also been made concerning a decision on ways to destroy chemical weapons stockpiles under international control. A ban on chemical weapons will also signify a need to eliminate production premises and to place under control certain chemical plants that produce substances necessary for the economy and that could be direct ingredients in the production of chemical weapons.

The problem of checking the implementation of the future convention's decisions is very important.

The point is to establish methods of verification and control that would guarantee adherence to the convention and at the same time would not be too burdensome and would not interfere with the security interests of the convention's member-states, nor threaten their sovereignty. Although this is one of the most difficult problems of the talks, progress was made last year in establishing international control over the convention's implementation. This function is meant to be performed by a consultative committee consisting of representatives of all parties to the convention, working in close cooperation with national bodies of control. This year we will try to lay down the framework for this cooperation.

As far as the prospects of a ban on chemical weapons is concerned, it is not easy to give a clear answer. In a political sense, these talks are connected with the situation concerning talks on other forms of disarmament, hence they are an integral part of the general climate of international relations. As we know, it is not our fault that the international situation is still not good. However, I do believe that with good cooperation between all parties in the talks, we will succeed in taking a further step forward this year in preparing the draft convention. However, one should recall that, as K. Adelman has said, the United States is still trying to force through its unrealistic proposals at the disarmament conference, which may exert considerable negative influence on the possibilities of making progress. I also wish to stress that one of the resolutions adopted at last year's UN General Assembly session recommends the fastest possible drafting of the convention. We regard this recommendation with great seriousness because it expresses the expectations of international society.

Space Arms Race

LD201749 Warsaw PAP in English 1120 GMT 20 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva, March 19: Chairman of the Polish delegation to the Geneva disarmament conference Stanislaw Turbanski today called on the conference to take early measures and appoint an appropriate body to help prevent the arms race in outer space.

He called attention to the fact that no measures had been effective so far in preventing the outer space from being abused for military ends. Therefore, said the speaker, the international community expects prompt progress in developing further international guarantees for protection of the outer space against the arms race.

Turbanski also recalled Soviet proposals in that respect and warned that rejecting them along with other similar proposals might soon lead to a rapid expansion of space armaments. The speaker criticised the U.S. arms programme.

The U.S., said he, wants to gain a military edge over the Soviet Union and capability of the first nuclear strike, without being itself exposed to a retaliatory strike.

CSO: 5200/13

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

PAPER COMMENTS ON CHERNENKO LETTER TO NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT GROUP

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 15 Feb 85 p 2

[Editorial: "Chernenko and the Nordic Countries"]

[Text] We will not shed crocodile tears on the printer's ink, but it makes you almost cry to see how some political activists behave. We are thinking of Eva Nordland and the movement "A Treaty Now," who have been fooled so completely that even a usually sympathetic newspaper like DAGBLADET has disassociated itself from them. A monumental blunder, the newspaper writes, and calls this a benign interpretation.

The so-called peace movements like "No-to-Nuclear-Weapons" and "A-Treaty-Now" are occasionally being accused of unconsciously playing the Soviets' game. Such claims may have more or less merit, but the current episode concerning the letters from Chernenko and Reagan do not exactly alleviate such suspicions. Indeed, in this case one can even wonder whether unconscious is the right word.

The fact that Eva Nordland--simply put--marketed the Soviet answer to the letter from A-Treaty-Now, but left the letter from the Americans in the drawer has naturally called forth strong reactions. Her explanations do not impress. The one letter is supposed to be from Chernenko himself, while the other one was only from the United States embassy in Oslo. Does Eva Nordland really believe that the greatly weakened Konstantin Chernenko himself wrote this answer, which was not even signed?

Argument number two is no more convincing. In contrast to the American answer the letter from the Soviets is supposed to contain new and interesting aspects. These include the Soviet willingness to guarantee a nuclear-free zone and discuss a similar status for the Baltic Sea.

This interpretation was already brutally destroyed the day before yesterday by NRK's [Norwegian Broadcasting System] Soviet expert Hans Wilhelm Steinfeld. He demonstrated that hardly one adjective was different in substance from what had been well known about the Soviet Union's positions as early as 1981. And the fact that there are no new and interesting aspects whatsoever was also confirmed by Secretary of State Sverre Stray.

As before, the letter contains non-binding suggestions about what the Soviet Union might possibly consider doing. The letter could be considered as an appeal to Norway to break out of the NATO alliance's joint negotiating position with regard to nuclear weapons, Stray emphasizes.

Naturally, an interest group such as A-Treaty-Now should also be aware of this if it wants to be taken seriously. In the best case, this shows a glaring naivete. Like our sister paper DAGBLADET we choose a benign interpretation. Less understanding people might well use other expressions.

12831

CSO: 3639/82

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

NUCLEAR-FREE BALTIC URGED--Tallinn, 18 February, TASS--"New possibilities for building up confidence and security not only in Europe, but also in the whole world would open, if the Baltic Sea is given a nuclear-free status, a TASS correspondent has been told today by Karl Rebane, president of the National Academy of Sciences of Estonia, a Soviet Baltic Republic. [No end quotes as received] Such a step, the scientist said, would lend a fresh impetus to international cooperation in the sphere of exploration and protection of the environment and live resources of the sea. Meanwhile he noted that nuclear weapons, even if they are used in local conflicts, could entail irreversible global consequences. It is necessary that the quest for ways of building up confidence should be reaffirmed by governments' concrete actions. The well-known Soviet physicist denounced the U.S. intention to put laser weapons into outer space. Placement of weapons in outer space increases, owing to technical errors, the probability of a nuclear catastrophe, said Karl Rebane. ["For Nuclear-Free North, for Nuclear-Free Baltic Sea"--TASS headline] [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2014 GMT 18 Feb 85 LD]

CSO: 1812/135

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

3 MAY 85
